THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE OF PROGRESS IN RELIGION

SEPTEMBER

1914

"Speak unto this people that they go forward"

NEW YORK CHICAGO
SAN ANTONIO

Unity Hymns and Chorals

NEW EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED

A NOBLE SUCCESSOR TO A MUCH LOVED HYMN BOOK

Edited by Frederick L. Hosmer and William C. Gannett

This book is meeting the expectations of the old friends.

Single copies, 50 cents. By mail, 60 cents. Fifty or more copies, to one address, 45 cents each. Boxing and carriage additional. Please indicate whether by freight or express. Sample copies for inspection by church committee sent on approval, returnable if not desired.

SEND ORDERS TO

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE

CHIGAOO

HOTEL CHELSEA

West Twenty-Third St.,

At Seventh Avenue

NEW YORK

The Fireproof Hotel of New York
European Plan. All Outside Rooms.
500 Rooms. 400 Baths.

Room with adjoining bath, $1.00 and $1.50; two persons, $2.00 and $2.50.
Room with private bath, one person, $2.00; two persons, $3.00
Suites, parlor, bedroom and bath, $3.00 and upward.

Three minutes from Pennsylvania Station, ten minutes from Grand Central Station. Within convenient walking distance of shopping and theatre districts. Nearest hotel to the steamship piers and to the railway terminals at foot of West Twenty-third Street.

Restaurant a la carte and table d' hote. Club Breakfasts, 35c; Luncheon 50c and Dinner 75c. Music.

Special terms to Tourists' Parties. New colored map of New York sent free on application.

New York Unitarian Headquarters

104 East Twentieth Street

Unitarian Books and Literature on Sale.

Subscriptions received for denomination periodicals.

Tracts and other descriptive literature for free distribution.

And always a cordial welcome for all visitors.

Miss Anna L. Wentz,
Clerk

U123
v.5-6

THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

GEORGE H. BADGER, Editor

ERNEST C. SMITH, Assistant Editor.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:—John Haynes Holmes, Edgar S. Wiers, George R. Gebauer, Alson H. Robinson, Albert R. Vail, Frederick R. Griffin, Everett D. Martin, J. E. Williams, Charles P. Wellman.

CONTENTS FOR SEPTEMBER, 1914

		PAGE.
Illusions of War	*Richard Le Gallienne*	2
Editorials		3
Goodness and Brains	*Everett Dean Martin*	6
Progressive Christianity More Than Liberal Belief	*Rev. George R. Gebauer*	7
La Via	*Harriet Lake-Burch*	9
The Unitarian Name: A Symposium		10
Mediation In Industry	*J. E. Williams*	16
A Sane Sunday	*The Editor*	18
Our Readers' Exchange		20
Browning and a Noted Hymn	*Sarah G. Pomeroy*	21
The Real Division In Christendom	*Rev. E. H. Reeman*	22
The Greatest of These	*Rev. James G. Townsend*	25
A Dream of the Almighty	*Peter Rossegger*	26
Commission on the New Denominational Name		26
Western Conference News		27
The Meadville Institute		27
The New England Fellowship Committee		28
The Ministers' Institute		28
Rev. "Billy" Sunday In Colorado Springs	*Thomas Salter Robjent*	29
New Books		30
The Reviews		32

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:—Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, of New York; Rev. Jabez T. Sunderland, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Pres. Franklin C. Southworth, of Meadville, Pa.; Rev. Thomas Van Ness, of Boston; Rev. Wilson M. Backus, of Minneapolis, Minn.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—One Dollar. Send remittance by check or money order, made payable to THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE, and addressed to the office of our Treasurer, 105 South Dearborn St., Chicago.

Office of Publication: MOUNT MORRIS, ILL.

NEW YORK, 61 East 34th Street. CHICAGO, 105 S. Dearborn Street.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

Entered as second-class matter October 2, 1913, at the post office at Mount Morris, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

11938

Illusions of War

War
I abhor,
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and fife! And I forget
Wet eyes of widows, and forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchery without a soul.

Without a soul—save this bright drink
Of heady music, sweet as death;
And even my peace-abiding feet
Go marching with the marching street;
For yonder, yonder, goes the fife,
And, what care I for human life!

The tears fill my astonished eyes,
And my full heart is like to break;
And yet 'tis all embannered lies,
A dream those little drummers make.

O, it is wickedness to clothe
Yon hideous grinning thing that stalks
Hidden in music, like a queen
That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the thing they lothe!

Art, thou hast many infamies,
But not an infamy like this,
O, snap the fife, and still the drum,
And show the monster as she is!

—By Richard Le Gallienne

The Unitarian Advance

Formerly The Unitarian—Established 1906

Volume V SEPTEMBER, 1914 Number 1

THE woeful tragedy of war has fallen heavily upon the world—to reveal to us anew with dramatic solemnity how after all the world is one. For we are all in the tragedy; and ultimately we are all in it *on the same side.* We on our American continent may congratulate ourselves that we are not in it; our favoring isolation permits us to stand aside as distant spectators, to watch the game. Clever journalists even try to figure it out how we Americans may be better off in the end because the rest of the world is fighting. But it won't go; in our hearts we all know better. The twentieth century permits no essential isolations. Civilization is too adhesive. We must suffer, we must help to pay the costs, we must share the stripes of affliction; materially, socially, morally, we are included, and must take some of the wounds of this stupendous catastrophy and crime of war. For war means the destruction of life-values, wealth-values, labor-values, and moral values—destruction to dead loss, enormous loss, with no compensating gains; and the total loss cannot be isolated or confined. We are all civilized together, to the degree in which we are civilized at all, and the ultimate fact of civilization is the distributing fellowship of humanity.

* * *

ULTIMATELY, although the nations of Europe are divided into hostile camps, the allies on one side doing their frightful utmost to hurt the allies of the other side, yet in final fact no nation can bring any calamity on any other without sharing in the curse of that calamity itself. Germany must pay not only for the desperate things which England or France or Russia bring upon her, she must pay also for the hateful things which she shall succeed in doing to her enemies. Only superficially and in external politics can one nation profit in the destruction which it brings to another. When final treaties are signed, in the last reckoning the cost bills are distributed equitably all around. Germany is hurting Germany when she wounds France, and England is destroying wealth for England when she preys on German domains. The simple fact is, the nations have maniacally conspired together to roll up an enormous sum of woe and horror and destruction and want; they are destroying things which all the world needs together. When it is all over, as in the case of the visitation of an earthquake, tornado or pestilence, all the world's people together shall realize their fellowship in appalling loss. For the world is one; and all humanity is on the same side of the black, wicked curtain of war's tragedy. All are allied together in the essential misery.

* * *

THERE are some dismal satisfactions in the fatuous optimism which tries to discover that "somehow good may come" out of the evil of international war. It is of course the business of optimism to look for the bright side of things. One says that perhaps out of it shall come the final realization of the futility of warfare and the quicker attainment of the consummation of Tennyson's dream (which everybody quotes now)—of "the Parliament of man, the Federation of the World." We needed one more great war to convince the world of the stupendous folly of war. Yet the shadow of such optimism is the sore acknowledgment that it was necessary for the world to go insane in order to discover the reasonableness of sanity. How appallingly absurd to confess that the intelligence of twentieth century humanity needed a concrete object lesson to convince it that the method of hell cannot ever be the way of rational progress! Another may say out of all this tragedy of warfare shall emerge the divine testing of human souls—such heroisms, such supurb valors and consecrations of sacrifice, such lofty idealizations of the fine passions of patriotism! All that sounds well, and of itself may be good. But how discouraging to discover, if we must discover it! that the noblest traits of human character cannot develop under

noblest conditions of human society, as though the transcendent triumphs of heaven-ideals were helpless under heaven-conditions, but demand the incentive of hell-conditions to give them compelling opportunity. There is something about such optimism which makes the most cynical pessimism wear rosy tints.

* * *

OF COURSE the essential business of a really robust optimism is not to discover "how all things make for good," but to find things to do resolutely to help bring that consummation about. The war is on, and we cannot help it. And it doesn't go very far even to discover with fierce anger whose fault it all is. But every man who loves his kind and reverences his ideal will find concrete reasons as never before for becoming actively enlisted in the cause that makes for the permanent establishment of the principle of arbitration and conciliation throughout the world. It may be America's good fortune, a little later, to play the part of peace-maker among the nations of Europe. It is good that we have an administration whose face is steadfastly fixed that way. We may well rejoice that just at the moment our own continent is not shadowed by war clouds; that the method of peace has prevailed in our relations with Mexico. The business of the churches of religion was never so distinct as now. We stand for peace; we stand for the ideal of human brotherhood; we stand for the vision of the prophets and the Christ, of swords beaten into plowshares, and peace on earth—the exalted mission of men of good will. But let's make the attitude of the churches in this matter more insistent—and more genuine! Let's not *stand* for things merely, but *push* for things; the exercising of the false ideals of "poetry-valor" and "romance war passion;" the demand that the barbarism of warfare shall be realized as such by legislators, educators, and by all prophets of religion.

* * *

SECRETARY WILSON undoubtedly rendered to our fellowship a distinctive service when he "sprung upon us" so alluringly at the last annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association his revolutionary proposition that we seek out a new denominational name which shall "at least be an alternative." The distinctive value of that service has been, of course, to awaken the general company of our people who had never given the matter much thought before, to the realization of the rich significance inhering in the name we already have. After all, the name "Unitarian" does mean good things, doesn't it? When we get to the heart of it, it means so much that is affirmative, constructive and inspiring. Mr. Wilson has helped us to discover that after all we are fortunate amongst the denominations of the world in having a name that really means something positive, definite, logical and progressive. It is simply "up to us" to realize the high potentialities of our inheritance. The letters which have been pouring into the columns of the *Christian Register* on this subject have a delightful practical unanimity. There is certainly not going to be any "quarrel"—hardly even a "dispute," simply an awakening, the thing that we need more than we need anything else. For this we must sincerely thank the genial secretary of the American Unitarian Association.

* * *

ONE interesting aspect of the discussion of the change of our denominational name has been the discovery that no one seems to be on hand with a suggestion of anything dramatically better. As a matter of fact, those religious fellowships which have had the supposed felicity of "naming themselves" have not been very fortunate about it, after all. Almost inevitably a self-chosen name is platitudinous, vague and undistinctive. For instance: "The Friends," "The Christians" (as a separate denomination), "Disciples of Christ," the "New Church" (Swedenborgian), "Latter Day Saints," "United Brethren," "Christian Science" (which is a joke!), "New Thought" and the like. Not one of these names has distinctive or dramatic appeal, though more than one presents amusing evidence of dramatic self-conceit. The denominational names that carry, and have distinction in men's minds have almost inevitably come not from deliberate choice, but either as convenient "nicknames" or convenient accidents of circumstance. That the leading denominations of protestantism take their names from their forms of church polity simply means that a detail of least fundamental significance has proved most con-

veniently descriptive. Is it a misfortune to our body that its serious title is not simply drawn from the way it transacts its organic business? To illustrate: is there a vital distinction between Presbyterians and Congregationalists, which these names embody? Then why are American Unitarians ready to be called Congregationalists, while English Unitarians as readily find Presbyterian congenial? Aren't we all, at any rate, Unitarians, on which ever side of the water we dwell? We surely are not all Presbyterians or Congregationalists.

* * *

LET us place in row the names which have been proposed by champions more or less eager (and we have to admit that the eagerness has been rather less than more), of "something better than Unitarian" in the columns of the *Christian Register* and elsewhere:

Free Churches.
Free Congregational Churches.
Independent Congregational Churches.
United Congregational Churches.
Churches of Fraternal Religion.
Cosmopolitan Christian Churches.
Church of Divine Unity.
Humanitarian Churches.

Really, is there one of these names that is distinctive or constructively descriptive in a way which has any dramatic missionary appeal—which could help anybody to understand what we are, as contrasted with other Christian bodies; or which could not be claimed by some other body as equally descriptive of itself?

* * *

ONE of the most interesting phases of Unitarian missionary enterprise across seas is the "Van Mission" in England. It is a "popular" enterprise, and of course some of its results lack the finish of our austere Unitarian "classicism." For instance, we discover our London contemporary, *The Christian Life*, in distress because some of the crass converts of the Van Missioners in one of the English towns have run to the press with some very crude ideas about our gospel, which "hurts our cause." For instance, one such iconoclast rashly asserts that "Unitarianism *is not a presentation of Christianity* or any other form of superstitious belief." Another boldly asserts that "with regard to fundamental doctrines, Unitarians have none; neither do they require crutches of that kind, because they are self-reliant men and women who believe in salvation by character." Again, it is uproariously asserted that "doctrines, creeds, and dogmas" are merely "the dry rot of the orthodox Christian churches." Worst of all, the cry goes forth that "Unitarianism excels orthodoxy in being *inconsistent* with scripture," while it is "consistent with truth and individual experience." Of course we have some sympathy with the consternation of our English friends. We know too well from actual experience the dismay of having our faiths presented crossly and mistakenly by the rash zeal of recent converts to whom negations first appeal.

* * *

YET there is a peril of "Unitarian orthodoxy" which may be too insistent that those receive our faith abate their ardors of new convictions to the accents of our austere traditions. After all, Unitarianism is what it is to the man who receives it. It is first of all the emancipation of the truth. And it must speak out with virility the joy of its freedom. To us long of the faith, the insistence comes easy that Unitarianism is but the flowering of essential Christianity—it is Christianity purified and redeemed. But the subtlety of this conception is not patent to all souls; and, after all, *we may be wrong!* Why dogmatize? Let the man who has eagerness of faith utter his eagerness in his own way. Unitarianism has, on the whole, suffered more from the repressions than from the over-exuberance of its eagerness. Blunders have undoubtedly been made in our name, and our cause has suffered sadly from blatant crudities of negative radicalism in one section or another. And yet if we are really out for converts, for the persuasion of souls among the people, the awful, splendid "common people," we must take the hazards of popularization resolutely. Let every prophet labor so to present the truth that we bear—in glad, constructive, genial and inclusive glory of truth—that those whom we win share the sanity and clarity and wholesomeness of the vision. But in heaven's name, let's not begin by taking fright at reckless eagerness, or seek to impress the spell of the muzzle upon those who come to us.

Not a few of our converts must talk like Ingersolls, or worse, or they cannot express themselves at all. A host of our converts must see the vivid contrasts of our faith to dominant orthodoxy plainer than they see anything else. Why worry? The best way to correct the blunders of crass eagerness is not to suppress it, but to outrun it with an eagerness still more lusty, that is full of sunshine and sweet reasonableness too. But the voice of triumphant Unitarianism is never—*"Hush!"*

WE ARE glad to add to our Editorial Board the name of Rev. Charles P. Wellman of Dorchester, Mass. Mr. Wellman was editor of "Old and New," the organ of the Iowa State Conference, at the time when that publication was merged with "The Western Conference News Letter," which afterwards became "The Western Conference Unitarian." and which finally lost its name by marriage with THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE. It is fitting therefore that he should now share our enterprise which has gathered in the fruits of the earlier enterprise with which he was associated. Mr. Wellman will have charge of our New England News department.

GOODNESS AND BRAINS.

By EVERETT DEAN MARTIN.

THERE are two things which every man thinks he may become without the slightest preparation or knowledge or previous thought on the subject. One of these things is to be a member of the city council, and the other is to be a saint. People seem to think that the sole qualification for these accomplishments is provided gratis in the constitution of the United States.

People seem hopelessly superstitious about these things. They just can't get it out of their heads that there must be some easy way to be good and wise by magic. They are almost shocked to learn that they have to use their brains to be good.

You cannot be a good mechanic without a long apprenticeship. You cannot be a good artist without long and patient effort. You cannot be a good musician without first passing through a long period of agony both for yourself and your neighbors.

A lady was once asked if she could play the piano. She said, "I don't know; I never tried." Even at that she was more modest than some people who presume to be amateur authorities on ethical matters.

You have to learn something to be good at anything. You must be intelligent to be really good at all. Goodness is first of all the practical difference between the correct and the incorrect way of doing some concrete act. It needs more than mere benevolent feelings.

If you mean to give a man food and through ignorance give him poison, your good intention is not enough.

Amateur goodness is too easy. It is chiefly negative. It consists mostly of a list of things you must not do. It does not emphasize enough the human excellence which comes with positive achievement.

Helen Keller might have been a paragon of virtue; might have been affectionate, and meek, and harmless, and patient; she might never have taken the name of the Lord in vain, might have abstained from cigarettes and alcoholic stimulants. She might have been exactly what is commonly called good. And yet she might have given up, plaintively or placidly accepted her affliction and remained all her life a helpless, amiable, useless, ignorant being.

The world is full of such pitiable creatures; they are good chiefly in a harmless, negative way. But Helen Keller is morally their superior, because her idea of goodness includes effectiveness, intelligence, self mastery, a brave struggle to overcome her limitations and be somebody.

You must be master of something to be good. You must know life. The best man is the man who can do things best, the man who makes the best use of his brains.

CULTURE is not measured by the greatness of the field which is covered by our knowledge, but by the nicety with which we can perceive relations in that field, whether great or small.

R. L. STEVENSON.

Progressive Christianity More Than Liberal Belief

By Rev. George R. Gebauer,

Minister of the First Unitarian Church in Duluth, Minn.

IN THAT noble address which President Taft delivered a short time ago in All Souls' church, Washington, he defines Unitarianism as "Progressive Christianity illustrating and carrying forward as the supreme ideal the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." I much like this definition of Unitarianism. It means that liberal faith is not something determined, settled, static, but something that is still developing, moving forward, onward, upward. It rightly intimates that we are not away from Christianity, but at the head of it. Certainly few will deny that what once was tabooed as rank heresy by orthodoxy is now preached from a thousand pulpits in the land as orthodox truth. What is called in our day liberal orthodoxy and new theology is simply the old-fashioned Unitarianism of 50 years ago. Unitarianism is mainly the Christian avant-guard, which is slowly and sometimes reluctantly followed by the main body.

We may not have greater and deeper religious thinkers and leaders, but we have, perhaps, the bolder spirits, the more independent thinkers, the men who are not afraid of the dark and who are strong enough to walk uprightly without the staff of tradition. We, too, have not less faith than the older church, but more. More faith in human nature, because we have abundant faith in the spirit of the universe which reveals itself in man. We do not believe in one revelation given at one time in history for all times to come; no, we rather believe in a progressive revelation or revealment of truth. To us God did not leave himself without witness in any nation and we see his hand not only in the history of Israel, but of every people, not only in the past but in the now. We do not believe less in Jesus than others, but we believe more in man than others. We believe in the divinity of Jesus, because we believe in the divinity, the divineness of man. To us the great problem of the church is not more dogma, but more faith, not less religion, but more and deeper religion which will not fear these revelations of science, but is in full harmony with all truth. Thus Unitarianism has not come to destroy, but to fulfill. It reveres the old, it holds in honor and love what the saints of old have said and done, but it reaches forth after greater and higher things of thought.

But there is another interpretation of progressive Christianity now, the theological notions are pushed entirely in the background. In that sense it may be that Unitarianism is not so much in the lead, nevertheless it is Unitarianism, which has pre-eminently the principle of it in its banner, when it says, that the essence of religion is not only "love to God, but love to man."

Faith Tested By Action It Inspires.

To speak of God's love and to preach about it is a beautiful thing, but may be and often is a very selfish thing. After we come to the temple of God, we say to ourselves: "How about this life of duty here, that confronts me and my family and my country? How may I best show the love of God I have sung about, my faith in the God of love, my love of the God of love?" Even the most progressive theology is not any vital advance in religion, it is not progressive Christianity in the best sense. Indeed, the world is somewhat weary of all religious professions, be they orthodox or liberal, that do not lead to worthy actions outside the sanctuary. The truth of any faith is in the action it inspires. If you can show me that blue and blind belief, no matter what denominational name you may give to it, will develop the most loving lives, lives ready to do and die for a better humanity, I say here is my progressive Christianity. I would say what if the creed be a little old-fashioned and will not line up with Darwin and Spencer, as long as it induces a man to "go" and "do." And if you could show me that nature worship will make a man a work-

er in the kingdom of good, make him noble and pure and kind and forgiving, and send his feet on errands of mercy, I would say go and worship your mother nature, and she is a truly Christian deity. And if you need pope and priest and mass and holy water to advance in Christian manhood, I would say, never miss a single mass and not only dip your fingers in holy water, and bathe your whole body and soul in it. The man who will go forward in Christian life is truly progressive and not the dreamer of doctrine, be it liberal or orthodox.

Ah, Christianity has advanced on theological lines, but has been slow in making its gospel a living thing. The churches, no matter what type, are challenged by the spirit of the son of man, who went about doing the will of the Father of love. His spirit is needed in our international relations. Talk about peace between the nations of the earth. Blessed be all honest efforts to bring about this universal peace. But let us not trust paper agreements. Heart agreements and truly mutual interests alone will count in critical times. There will be no peace among nations until the Christian ideal of brotherhood becomes a reality, until the brotherhood of man will mean more than nationality and citizenship, and national honor and national welfare. There will be no peace until we put above the stars and stripes the flag of humanity.

If we want peace let us approach every nation in the spirit of good will, open to her the doors of trade, the doors of opportunity will be opened to us and between such nations there will be no occasion for war. They are bound together by the spirit of mutual brotherly interest.

We need Christian progress in political life within the country. Who does not see that our political corruption has long passed the stage of mending and reforming? We need nothing less than regeneration in body and members. The regeneration must come through the efforts of Christian men and women. Christian principle must be put in the place of the individual or class or sectional interest. If this is not done, graft and bribery in one form or another will continue. All reform will be vain except they proceed in a truly religious spirit full of Christian enthusiasm.

Education Alone a Caricature.

But the political life, which we would transform, rests upon the social life in general and it is easy to see, that politics will only be regenerated when society itself, will have become a new creature, with new ideals of life. In our strange and untoward social conditions we need above all working Christianity. The family, the school are almost helpless without the support of the religious ideal. We begin to see that education without religion is a caricature. We begin to understand that except marriage is accepted as a holy and binding sacrament, at least as the most sacred contract a man can go into, the family will disappear and with it the civilization built upon it. And what of the conditions of legal justice in our land which cries for betterment? A progressive Christianity is here needed to brush away the barbarisms which pass in our enlightened century for justice. Conditions are not up to the Christian ideal of justice in love. They are indeed fundamentally wrong, when in Minnesota minors may be sentenced to life-long imprisonment. Matters are wrong when a man escaping from imprisonment and living 14 years uprightly, a useful citizen, by the hounds of justice can be dragged back to prison. Matters are absolutely shameful when an innocent man can be kept in jail for 20 years, and is then discharged broken in body and soul, pardoned for a crime he never committed, sent forth into the world without receiving any redress or compensation for all his suffering. Such conditions must needs breed anarchism. We need the Christian ideal of brotherhood employed in our dealings with the weak and the defective. We do not want more jails and prisons and chambers of torture, but institutions in which men will learn a better way of life and if the lesson has been learned will be turned back to society regardless of what their offence may have been.

So again in regard to social justice and the social evil. Social justice, the dream of all reformers will only be realized when the Christian ideal of love to man will be the social ideal. Not that we do not want direct social "agitation," but that we need still more social "re-

generation." We need right minded men, if righteousness shall prevail and wealth shall truly become common wealth. We need Christian men and women, if ours shall become a republic of God.

And closely related to this matter of social justice, is that of the social evil in various forms, open or concealed, which is at present agitating the social world. Here the hand and the brain of progressive Christianity is needed. All legislation which simply concerns itself with the evil results is insufficient. To clear out the red light district and to drive the inmates out of town is about as moral and sensible as to close the small-pox hospital and to send the patients abroad. What we need is justice and common sense and Christian love. We must work for social sanitation, must work for prevention rather than for doubtful reform; we must take a stand against immoral commercial industrial conditions, which breed immoral sexual relations.

As long as society will permit starvation wages to be paid to young girls, the social evil in one form or another will flourish. As long as we do not guard our places of amusement, do not place police matrons in our theaters, skating rinks, dance halls; as long as we permit minors unescorted, to frequent such places, we shall have fallen girls and women, not only in houses of prostitution, but in respectable homes. Religion must go hand in hand with law and with proper education and enlightenment in sexual matters to bring fruitful results. The relation between man and woman is a sacred, holy thing and Christianity must fail except it go forward in the fight for purity.

The churches may differ in their creeds and beliefs, but they are at one in their Christian principles. Progressive Christianity leaves creed and dogma in the church, and goes forth on the highway of life to make these principles count in the life of the community; it shows that it worships the God of love by simple and loving service to man.

WE want free churches in this free land,—churches that are strong, yet delicate; massive, but tender; Christlike and constant, gracious and good. And we want all who are one with us in this purpose to join hands and help us. Every large, free thinker should stand by such freedom; every believer in God, not as shut up in a corner and hemmed in by fire-bars, but as in the whole world, with all men for his children, should be glad of such a faith; and I doubt not but the time is coming when this will be the universal religion. We must work for that time, give our money for it, our labor, and, if need be, our life.

ROBERT COLLYER.

LA VIA.

BY HARRIET LAKE-BURCH.

Standing one side I see the human press
Pass and repass. See from another plane
My myriad-self living and struggling on
In many forms, and feel the doubt and fear
In lifted faces turned toward the stars
Asking the secrets of the universe
World-old and hungered in the midst of it.
Mayhap I look into the very eyes
And recognize without a breath's delay
Though stranger and unknown he seem, one whom
Time could not bring me nearer though the days
Piled for a thousand years about our door;
And silently our souls exchange their wares
And we go on in blissful ignorance
And wonder at the strength we have received
And never guess wherein the virtue lay.

Would someone publish us the mystic way
We benefit in surging thoroughfares
Where forms and faces we have never known,
Solace our life and send us more content
Into a future where no chance may bring
A like environment of body or of soul
Ever again?—Yet who has not received
The compensating energy of will
From some glad face or voice and felt the throb
Surge in unhindered waves where human forms
Beat out the moving symphony of life
Upon a city street?
What influence indeed can last so long
As that chaste unsought good of many lives
Whose nameless benediction covers men
In mart and mine as well as holy days?
What cowl can over-match the covering
Of him who honest, toils for honest bread,
And what glad sun shone gladlier on a day
Because of priest or prelate? Nature bears
No malice in her heart for any thing.
She covers with her kindly smile all good
And quite as eagerly protects the weed
As though a fragrant blossom nestled there.
Strange disrespect is evidenced, as when
Kings have to die and beggars still may live;
Or happy children smiling in their sleep
Are clothed in little shrouds, while age and pain
Totters along with wishing how to cease
From being.—And the nameless recompense
Which conscience cannot give or take away
Once the swift years have piled it on the heart
Forever.

The Unitarian Name

A Symposium.

THE suggestion so interestingly made by Secretary Wilson at the last annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association that we need a new denominational name involves an issue that is not merely academic or sentimental, but insistently practical. Mr. Wilson himself frankly presented his suggestion on this ground: "The period has arrived," he said, "when, if we are to take advantage of the world-wide opportunities now awaiting us, we should have, *for our practical* use, at least as an alternative, a new and more adequate name. Many of us who, in our missionary endeavors have had to contend against the insuperable prejudices which, especially outside of New England, have been long associated with the name Unitarian, have for a long time realized the weight of our unsolicited and unnecessary burden."

We have sought to obtain from a number of men who have had practical experience in fields outside of New England, just what their experience in this regard has been. We asked them: "Is the name 'Unitarian' actually a handicap in our church extension work outside of New England? Would a change of name help us? What better name would you suggest?" We sent our letter to the field secretaries of departments, and a representative number of pastoral workers. We regret that we could not receive answers from them all; the vacation season is not favorable for "Symposium Collectors," but we believe that the communications here presented have an interesting and significant value.

The Editor.

Here are the answers received:

Rev. Ernest C. Smith, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference:

IN THE effort to find "a name more expressive of the actual purpose of our denomination" than the present term "Unitarian," I recognize a quickening vision somewhat blurred by a common superstition.

The vision is that of a world-wide opportunity and of a larger, more vital cooperation with like-minded, like-hearted men and women, who cannot comfortably bear our present name. It recognizes a call to larger service than our church has yet been able to render to the world; it is ready to sacrifice all non-essentials that free religion may prevail in the world; it sees with the eye of faith a coming renaissance of spiritual power in our churches and in the world; it cries, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." By this vision I am stirred. In its service I am enlisted.

The superstition is the expectation that any change of name can initiate a great spiritual movement or even, following such a movement in natural order, can greatly effect the course of its development. While it is true that our present name and its implications sometimes prejudice people against us, according to my observation the prejudice frequently is not dissipated when people get to know us well. It is not our *name* that is primarily objected to, it is our mode of thought and our prevailing temper, the kind of people we are. And this temper, to which they object, while it contains some things not admirable which we ought to outgrow, contains also what is most precious in our heritage and most potent in our present vision. The older, traditional Unitarianism has at least partially leavened the lump, and prejudice against it where contacts have been long continued has largely died away. It is precisely the new, expanding Unitarianism, that is not willing to keep within the old limits and is ever expressing itself in new ways, that is feared and hated. It is the spirit rather than the letter which gives offense. Our newer churches have never been conscious of the historical antagonisms, but only of the present vision. They have no traditions, save those which they themselves have made. If there are prejudices they are due not to the name, but to the people who bear it and whose thought, word and action make the meaning of the name in a given community. In the face of these funda-

mental facts a mere change of name is futile.

We may well share the vision—be conscious of our own shortcomings, desire to serve in nobler measure, with wider horizons, in more vital ways and to enter into larger coöperation with all men of good-will. But we must work from roots to fruits, from center to circumference. We need a change of heart more than we need a change of name. Not a new name, but a new life is the great desideratum. This is, of course, the heart of the vision and the present discussion of the name will justify itself just in so far as it helps to make the vision clear and commanding and quickens this inner life.

Rev. F. M. Bennett, Field Secretary for the Middle States and Eastern Canada:

REPLYING to your question, I beg to say that I am convinced that the name "Unitarian" is not a handicap in church extension work outside of New England.

I have done considerable work of this kind, and I find that the name is a first rate advertisement, even in the hands of those who misunderstand and, ignorantly or willfully, misrepresent us. It is pretty well understood that "Unitarians are not orthodox." Moreover the name is one which throughout the country is coming to be much respected even by those who think they are our enemies. It is gathering weight and dignity and worth everywhere. Our opportunity is one which demands that we give the name and the reality for which it stands, the proper content and meaning. I doubt if there is a larger name in religion unless it be "Christian," and in the hands of those who use it as it should be used "Unitarian" should be inclusive of "Christian." I doubt if we could find a larger or more inclusive name. Those who object to it are the narrowly sectarian, or those who are indifferent to its real meaning. Any liberal who is willing to assume the responsibilities of freedom in religion will be glad to use the name "Unitarian." Even "Billy" Sunday is fast finding out that to mention us even in anathema is to help build up our churches.

Rev. J. T. Sunderland, Minister of the Church in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.:

IT SEEMS to me that the three most desirable names for religious bodies that we have in the Christian world today —the three that are distinctly broadest and largest, least sectarian, least superficial, most ethical and spiritual, and therefore most adequate as banner words for great and noble religious movement, are the names, "Universalist," "Unitarian," and "Catholic." A moment's thought will show why this is so.

The Universalist name is the natural and proper designation for a religious body or movement based upon the great *Universals* of religion, the Catholic name for a body based upon the great *Catholicities,* and the Unitarian name for a body or movement based upon the eternal *Unities.* A Christian Church possessing any one of these great names may well regard itself as fortunate.

How large and noble they all are is seen as soon as we compare them with others; for example with Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Congregationalist, names indicating such comparatively unimportant matters as forms of church government; with Baptist, indicating loyalty to a single church ordinance; with Methodist, indicating certain methods of church organization and management; or with Lutheran or Calvinist, names taken from certain religious leaders. All these names are in their very nature narrow, limiting, more or less superficial, more or less accidental; not one of them is based upon anything ethical or spiritual or essential to religion.

On the other hand, the names Unitarian, Universalist and Catholic (not *Roman* Catholic—that is limiting) are all at the farthest possible remove from the limiting or the superficial; they signify the largest things, the deepest things, the most uniting things, the most certainly enduring things that religion can know.

Of course names are not of first importance in religion or anything else. A man may be very great with a very insignificant name, or very insignificant with a very great name. The same is true of church or religious movement. We who are known as "Unitarians" may well bear this in mind. But if we are going into the business of discussing names

with a view to discovering the best, let us not be blind to the unsurpassed greatness and worth of the name we already possess.

Rev. Maxwell Savage, Minister of the Church in Louisville, Ky.:

YOU ask me if, in my experience in California and Kentucky, I have found the name "Unitarian" a handicap. No, I have not seen this name, apart from its message, acting as a stumbling block. The minds of many people need to be disabused of wild ideas concerning what we stand for, but a change or modification of the name will not do that.

Our message, by any other title, would be just as unpleasant to the ears of those who will not hearken. On the other hand I have found an increasing number of people who are hearkening and to them the name "Unitarian" is welcome, for it sums up their growing thoughts and emotions.

It seems rather futile to me for us to go through the ceremony of making our name the scapegoat for our sins of omission and then driving it into the desert of disuse. Those who dislike us do so not because of our name, but because of what we stand for. Instead of giving our thoughts to a change or modification of name we should be busy making up for our sins of omission. What are they? A spirit of compromising which results in lack of definiteness in our sermons and church services: a failure to preach our Gospel: a failure to see, or seeing, to express the content of this fine name of ours and make it glorious: a spirit of tolerance which if honestly translated would be revealed as indifference: a failure to imbue the young man in our theological schools with the missionary spirit: a remarkable slackness and indifference on the part of many Unitarian parents as to what sort, if any, of religious training their children get: and lack of appreciation of our own Unitarian seers, singers, saints and prophets.

I understand that some people object to our Unitarian name, saying that it refers the minds of those who hear it simply to the theological idea of the oneness of God. The minds of more people ought to be referred definitely to that point and to all that it means in the relationship between God and Jesus and Man. The Episcopalians constantly refer during their services to the idea of Three in One and One in Three. We might do worse than take the suggestion and in our services refer more often, not less, to the Oneness of God.

The cause of our weakness is not to be found in the strength of orthodoxy but in our own weakness of spirit and the resultant failure to drive home our message.

Let us keep this name which so accurately describes our faith in the Unity of God and Humanity and the Universe.

Rev. Eleanor E. Gordon, Minister of the Church at Orlando, Fla., and Formerly Secretary of the Iowa State Conference:

SOME one has said that creeds are valuable as long as they are used as sign boards but become a menace when used as hitching posts.

The same may be said of names. As an historical sign board marking a theological era in the history of the American Congregational Church the name Unitarian has its value. As a word in any sense defining the aim, method, spirit, or message of the faith we love, it certainly falls far short. We do not need to consider for a moment the question of the name being unpopular or a term of reproach. This has been true of all words that have stood for the beautiful realities of life.

There is a certain movement in religion, a certain attitude of mind, that for a hundred years, to go back no farther, has made glad the hearts of untold men and women. Is the word Unitarian a fitting designation for this beautiful thing? If it is, hold to it and defend its honor as we would defend the honor of our own individual names. If some other word seems better, then with loyalty and enthusiasm use that word.

An appeal to our personal experience may help to make plain how little we value this word as in any sense an explanation of our religious faith. The twenty-five years of my ministry have been spent almost entirely on the frontier. More often than I desired I have been obliged to take for sermon theme some form of the question "Why I am a Unitarian"; I have no manuscript of these sermons but I do not remember a single

instance where I entered upon any discussion of the doctrine of the trinity or of the value of a belief in the unity of God.

But, on the other hand, is it not true that the name Unitarian as fully and completely defines our position as the words Presbyterian, Congregational, or Lutheran, define the distinctive message of these churches?

The word Presbyterian does not bring to my mind a certain form of church government. I think, when I hear the word, of a certain attitude toward modern problems in philosophy and science. The word Catholic does not suggest to my mind what it should by virtue of its derivation.

On the front of our little chapel in Orlando, Florida, are the words, Unity Chapel, and underneath in parenthesis is the word Unitarian. Some one suggested that the limiting word Unitarian spoiled the significance of the inclusive word Unity. "In a way it does," I replied "but historical honesty seems to require it should be there but if we can make Unity Chapel stand in this community for the great realities of freedom, fellowship, service and character we need not be afraid of any limiting word."

Whatever word or words may be chosen in the future to define our position in the great world of religious endeavor they will be but sign and symbol of a vision and an aspiration that will far transcend the definition.

Rev. Arthur L. Weatherly, Minister of All Souls' Church, Lincoln, Neb.:

TO CHANGE the name of a movement that has roots going back into the pre-Reformation period by a majority vote of the representatives of the free churches associated under the name Unitarian is a manifest impossibility. To endeavor to compel people who call themselves Unitarians to do otherwise is an absurdity.

Even if the National Conference and the American Unitarian Association should broaden their respective titles it would not signify much unless it was accompanied by a change of attitude on the part of their individual members which made new titles imperative. If we really agreed with Channing when he said "My fellowship is with all who seek the truth" we would, I am very sure, be passionately desirous of breaking down any barrier standing between us and any other truth seeker. If we cared more for brotherhood, for fellowship than for a name or a tradition, then we would forget all the things these imply in our larger passion. Thrusting, yea, throwing these aside we would rush into the arms of those who await our coming.

It is the duty of the man possessing a truth to strip it of all individual and personal connotations in order that other men shall see not the Truthbearer but the Truth.

It is all very well to quote Channing, Parker and Mortinean but the man on the street is not acquainted with these heros of our faith. He has a fixed and established idea of what Unitarianism means. In the Middle West it is rooted in the common thought by the preaching of narrower and more sectarian men than our great leaders and by the teaching of the orthodox churches, and this is not only true of Middle West but also of other parts of the country. This idea is that our "Unitarian" churches are based on the denial of the duty of Jesus, or the denial of the Trinity. In fact we are looked upon by the great masses of people as a narrow sectarian body, narrower in many respects than the orthodox for they are built on an affirmation and we on a negation. It is true that one can find many individuals who do not hold this mistaken point of view. But these are comparatively few in number.

And even in our own churches there is the constant insistence on "Our Faith," "Our belief," and "Our little Creed," as one minister expressed it. A group of women in a New England city, all members of Unitarian churches were discussing a comparatively short time ago the conditions of membership in their churches. They agreed with one exception that non-belief in the Deity of Jesus was the sole and fundamental basis of such membership. When these views are very commonly held and expressed by Unitarians and when orthodox ministers all over the country are teaching that we are a negative body it is strange that a barrier exists between us and many truth loving, truth seeking men and women. When I went to Lincoln I raised the

banner of Unitarianism as high as I could. I put the word Unitarian on all our literature. I explained again and again through the pulpit and press the large and inclusive meaning which was attached to the word, and after four years I found I had made as much impression as I would have by attacking a mountain with a tooth pick. Again and again men and women of intelligence revealed by their comments on our church that I had utterly failed to make any impression on the adamant of preconceived opinion. So failing to remove the barrier by explanation I just went around it. Our church has for its name that inclusive title All Souls. We added this descriptive phrase, "A Free Religious Society." By ourselves, I admit, we can do but little to remove the impression in the minds of the people. Just so long as those who seek an universal, unsectarian fellowship believe that we are not such they will not come to us.

To meet this situation, first, I should like to have the help that would come from the removal of all sectarian labels, mottoes and quotations from our literature; second, the broadening of the invitation of the American Unitarian Association to include all who are in sympathy with the latter portion of the 1896 National Conference declaration instead of confining it to "Unitarian Christians"; third, the change of the name of the National Conference so that it would indicate that its fellowship is as wide as its declaration; fourth, the asking of all new churches to take broad and inclusive names that thoughtful people at least can easily understand to be such, and as far as possible to have old churches add to their names descriptive phrases that will directly emphasize our wide fellowship.

Rev. George Gilmour, Minister of the Church at Dallas, Tex.:

AFTER fighting our battles for almost a century under a banner named Unitarian, does wisdom cry out for a new name on the banner?

Our name has its advantages; it is at least understood. Every religious movement, a century old, is fairly well interpreted by the public. If the word Unitarian has had for decades a negative meaning to most Christians, it is no doubt due to shortcomings on both sides.

We have not always been sufficiently constructive in our portrayal of Jesus. A Unitarian of the occident will, possibly, for centuries more, make a great deal of the man of Nazareth. Every Unitarian Church that aims to forward its great ideal of personal and social progress will adapt itself to the Christian consciousness of western lands, just as we should make much of Gautama's life if we were preaching in India, or Confucius, if in China. Gautama would rightly receive the same emphasis there that we give to Jesus here. And there is no inconsistency in this, since we are aware of a great similarity in the fundamental principles of every great religion.

Our name has been largely misunderstood, because in emphasizing the human origin of Jesus, it has been practically impossible to satisfy the opposition that we were heart and soul believers in the central gospel of the man of Nazareth.

But a great day always arrives when a local Unitarian church convinces an American city that a Unitarian is the *"great believer"* in Jesus. We can never have our rightful place in American religious life until we have made Jesus as beautiful as he was, and have performed this work better than the leadership of Trinitarian pulpits. Herein lies the greatest immediate task of Unitarianism, to make ourselves understood [illegible] where misunderstanding has been easy, and natural. And just so long as a majority of Christian people are sure we do not care much for so great a person as Jesus, any name we have will be a great hindrance towards reaching an unbiased public.

Quite a few of our ministers have no doubt noticed a growing appreciation of the name Unitarian in their city or town where the sympathetic and courageous Jesus has had a steady influence on their own Unitarian pulpit and pews.

I can see little reason for changing our name at a time when the theological views of our Unitarian Fathers are readily accepted by liberal Trinitarian leadership.

The really important next step is to still further deepen and broaden the name Unitarian in the public mind. Let us identify it in every city and town with that message of Jesus: he that is greatest among you, let him be the true servant of

his fellows. Our Unitarian name must be respected and loved when this great spirit possesses a Unitarian church; the marks of a truly great religious movement are readily noticed when it expresses earnestness, intelligence and boldness in actually living out the personal and social ideals. Unitarianism may be reverenced as one of the great words of life. Let us all do our part.

Rev. George Kent, Minister of the Church at New Orleans:

WHETHER to hold fast the name of "Unitarian" as the foremost, and the best, of names for our church depends altogether upon whether it is in us to make our church worthy of so great a name.

To my mind no happier nor more prophetic fate ever befell a nicknamed people than when we were dubbed "Unitarian." Jesus and his church have given greatness to a name that in itself is still a jibe at Jewish self-importance. The Methodists have forced a fine significance upon a name essentially mean and insignificant, as its inventors intended it to be.

But "Unitarian!" with all the narrow and shallow implication of its first use as an epithet of scorn what breadth and height of meaning it was, competent to serve! And it looks as if every line of modern research and experience has led to some rich fulfillment of the possibilities that lay in "Unitarian" as a word of the finest and amplest import. To glance at instances apart from the religious: In our day, new worlds, of celestial range and immensity and of infinitesimal vibration and minuteness have swung within the ken of science. But the sublimest discovery of science has been that all these worlds are not at war, but constitute a Universe. There is one order everywhere, making for science one glorious, harmonious field of study. To seek the strength and unanimity of Science in our day, to feel its courage and catch the spirit of its enterprise is to find it Unitarian, certain that all phenomena will yield evidence of one order, one sane intelligibility, one Universe with nothing alien nor unnatural. It is true of the scholar equally with the scientist. As students and teachers of every kind of knowledge the faculty of any modern University stand together for this inescapable unitarianism of all learning. Learning brings to light the fundamental fellowship of all histories and arts and languages and literatures and institutions—all the children of one life and mind. And the gathered schools of such learning bear token of it in the name they take, of "University." So too, in the busy, work-day world, the man to do things, the missionary, the statesman, the journalist, the social and industrial worker of tomorrow is going to be, in this grasp of the one human nature and experience, practically Unitarian, and thereby is going to be intelligent in principle and effective in performance.

In fact there isn't any word of larger import, if we want to describe man's better grip upon the universe, his wiser estimate of truth, his wider view of human relationship, and the higher and more efficient conduct that all of it is leading to, than "Unitarian," used in a perfectly secular, simple sense.

But it's in the field where the word is peculiarly our own that the greatness of it most impresses me. As the name of a religious message to mankind; as the Gospel—of a Faith to be held, of a principle to work upon, of a path to follow, it strikes me that there isn't a fitter nor a nobler name attainable! If the one salvation for men is religion then the one salvation for religion is a sufficiently broad and inclusive Unitarianism. Not as against Trinitarianism, but as against a welter of half-gods and devils and delusions and determinisms and despairs that are being enthroned as rulers of the Universe. The Christian Church has been anti-Unitarian in a worse sense than being Trinitarian. It has neutralized one Power with another God and Devil. It has negated one Process with another, Creation and Ruin. It has aborted one end with another. Everlasting Good and Everlasting Evil. And the outcome in common thought is "confusion worse confounded."

It dominates the most intense and urgent minds of our day. Preachers, reformers, radicals raise the cry of a wild and desperate anti-Unitarianism. What antipathies of God and Nature! What alienation of God and man! What disparity between the world God made and the one we have! What fell antagonism between our toiling, fighting, learning,

loving humaness and what God wanted us to be! What a hard, wrong, cruel, hateful state of things we have to strive against! What hideous deformity our social development from the way it should have grown! (One of our own men wrote it down the other day as "sick unto death!")

There is only one adequate remedy for this pernicious and embittering god-and-devil doctrine. It lies in a sufficiently comprehensive Unitarianism.

Such as we have already, outside religion and reform. Engineers, chemists, artists, horticulturalists have a Unitarian faith that is at once their inspiration and their indomitable cheer. To them there is one faithful order that can be absolutely counted on. And it means no good world once upon a time and a bad one ever since. It means a good world in the making now, with every engineer and chemist and artist and gardener called to the creative partnership.

In Religion, above all, such faith is needed. There, if anywhere, the inspiring, rejoicing faith should be in one God and maker of all, one Nature forever serving His divine good will, one creative order at its work in all the toiling, fighting, serving, sorrowing, rejoicing, dying, living experience we have known, one fellowship of God and man, one religion wherever man feels called to do his part with God in making life and mind and loving will the end worth all the way that reaches it, one family of man, one common human welfare, one Life to be made more and more abundant in imperishable souls. This all-embracing religious Unitarianism is to be the rescuing faith for some church to make the sunshine and warmth and power of our Twentieth Century as it approaches noon. It seems to me that if our church is great enough to do it, it can have no greater name to do it under than UNITARIAN.

Mediation In Industry

By J. E. Williams,

[*An address delivered in New York City before the Exhibit of Better Industrial Relations.*]

THE first attempt to bridge the gulf between capital and labor was by arbitration. It became more or less discredited, because the losing side could not be brought to accept its decisions in a good spirit; sometimes due to the outside arbitrator being unfamiliar with the technique of the industry. At the recent hearing of the Federal Industrial Commission in Washington neither the employers or union representatives who testified seemed to heartily favor the old-fashioned outside arbitrator.

The next experiment was that of conciliation, where an equal number of each of the parties in dispute met together to discuss their differences, and tried to bring their minds to a meeting point by full and frank conferences. This went far in the direction of promoting a peaceful understanding; but it was often cumbrous and unsatisfying, and to frequently tended to convert its conferences into debating societies.

The latest attempt at a nexus is that of the appointment of a mediator with power to act. In the Cloak and Suit industry of New York it takes the form of a committee of three, one chosen by the union, one by the employers' association, and the third impartial man chosen by the representatives of both these interests, whose decision in case of a difference shall be final.

These three act together as a commission to pass on grievances as they arise. They visit the factories, call out the foreman and workers, listen to testimony and arguments, and often decide the case on the spot. In March, 506 complaints were adjusted in this industry, all but 19 being settled by the deputies.

The 19 that came up to the Committee on Immediate Action were decided unanimously without disagreement.

Agreement is the goal for which modern mediation strives. As one who has had experience in the old and new methods or arbitration and mediation the dif-

ferences seem to me to be radical, fundamental.

In the past it has too frequently been accepted that the business of the arbitrator was to apply some a priori or pre-existent principle of justice to the solution of his problem; that his standards were ready made and all he had to do was to discover and enforce them.

The failures of arbitration have been in large measure due to the notion that this standard of absolute right existed and could be formed and applied like a yard stick. What we find today is that the yard stick must be made; that the situation must be made to yield its own criteria.

The main concern must be to clear away the fog of misunderstanding, cut down to the heart of the problem, lay bare the real interests of both parties, and see if a common ground cannot be found on which the parties can be brought to stand. His attitude must be more that of a mediator than a judge; he must have the insight to see, the invention to construct, the mastery to command respect, and the self-effacement necessary to make of himself a bridge over which the parties may pass in their coming together.

But there is one point on which he cannot be impartial. On the question of the worth of trades unionism he must not be neutral. He must be a strong, even an enthusiastic believer in trades organization. Only so can he gain the confidence and moral support of the workers, for without that his efforts are futile. It is the weak union that is dangerous, lawless, unreliable. The strong union alone can discipline its insubordinators, quell its insurrectors, enforce the decisions of the Committee, and give stability and peace to the industry.

The union at its best is the greatest democratizer, the best school of ethics we have; even at its worst it compels the subordination of individual interest to that of the group. Welfare work that is handed down from above is good; but it cannot be compared with the self-generated interest, the initiative, the loyalty, the idealistic devotion to a cause that comes up out of the heart of unionism.

The goal of modern unionism is industrial partnership. It knows the world's work must be done, and it seeks not to hinder but to coöperate in the doing of it. But if it is to be loyal to the business; if it is to promote efficiency of production; if it is to transfer the burden of shop discipline from the employer's shoulders to its own; if it is to free his mind from the nerve racking dread of strife: if it is to give peace, stability and uninterrupted prosperity to the business; if it does all this it feels, and it has a right to feel, that it is entitled to a just and increasing share of the proceeds.

And in this the modern mediator can be of vast assistance to both parties. He can be an investigator to ascertain the actual facts of the situation; he can verify and validate the claims of the employer; he can interpret them to the employe and he can, if he has earned the right to be trusted, clear away the vain imaginings, the wrong apprehensions of the worker—and these are frequently the cause of most serious misunderstandings. And if the situation will admit of the granting of the workers' claims, the mediator can so certify to their validity that the employer will be hardly likely to refuse. He can be the agent of publicity, the medium through which verified information can pass from one side to the other.

The modern mediator does not pretend that the interest of the two parties are identical, but he does believe that in a vast majority of cases there are parallel lines of interest which if discovered and wisely directed may be made to converge.

The operation by which the lines are brought together is a construction, not a decision—and that is where modern mediation differs from the old arbitration. It is a synthesis which brings all the diverse factors of the problem to a common centre and reconciles them.

In conclusion, let me caution you not to put too much trust in machinery. The makers of this exhibit have of necessity driven to lay stress on those aspects which lend themselves to exhibition, and these, naturally, were the formal, the objective features. But mediation is not primarily a matter of machinery. Mechanism there must be, but only enough to furnish a channel for the human spirit.

The mediating nexus must be personality—the good will, the clear insight, the warm sympathy, the fervent faith of human souls. It must include a devotion to social ends, a passion for rationality, a

loyalty to the protocol or agreement that will resist the attempts of either side to rupture it; and, above all, an unshakeable conviction that the human will, the human intelligence, is adequate to the solving of human problems; that they are here to exercise the ghosts of laissez faire, to conquer the unintelligent forces of impersonal nature, to advance on the Lords of Chaos and the Dark; in a word, to coöperate with God in the building of a cosmos, to make of this earth a Paradise where men and women may live fair, free and well conditioned lives.

A Sane Sunday

By the Editor.

THE custom of Sabbath observance is not one shared by Christianity with the other great world religions, as are its belief in God, immortality, a sacred scripture, and a God-incarnating personality of unique character. It inherits this institution from the Jewish religion from which it sprang. It is interesting however to note the significance of this inheritance. Originally the Sabbath-observance amongst the Hebrews was like most of their traditional law, a matter of good health. The Hebrew mind was practical above all things else, and ethical sanity has always played a larger part than ocult mysticisms in their spiritual evolution. The "Ten Words," or "Commandments" reach very far back, doubtless to the days of Moses, and brought to focus the traditions existing before his time.

The commandment regarding the "Sabbath" stands prominent amongst them: Its body takes the form of the other commandments, that of negative restraint. In the childhood of nations, as in individual life, the "Thou shalt not" comes first; the beginning process of ethical progress being the winnowing out of things that can be done from things that must not be done. So here the significant thing is "Thou shalt not!"

But, shalt not—what? "Thou shalt not work on the Sabbath day." That is the sum total of it. There is no "Thou shalt not enjoy thyself, thou shalt not sing, or laugh, or dance or sport," simply, "Thou shalt do no work"—stop the treadmill business of the other days of the week—rest, today!

On the whole, I do not imagine that the workers of those earlier times could find this form of prohibition any more disagreeable than the toilers of today!

To be sure, before the "Thou shalt not" goes something affirmative. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." What did *holy* mean? Not all that it means with some people today. The Hebrew word originally meant simply that which is separated, *set dpart,* given a distinction of difference from the usual run of things. This distinction grew to be a distinction of higher worth, and finally was applied to that *set apart for God.*

Now it depends on what idea of God you have as to the quality ascribed to things set apart to him. If you have a disagreeable, uncomfortable, idea of God then "Holy things" will be disagreeable things. If your God is hard and arbitrary, a mirth-killer, a joy-hater, then everything associated with God will have joy-spoiling quality. But the early Hebrews did not have such an idea. Their God was a joyous God, and their day set apart to God was a day of joy, a feast-day, when they did not have to work.

In later days when the loftier ethical idealisms of the prophets glorified the religion of Israel the Sabbath day was the time to "meditate on the Lord," to gather into synagogues and learn of him; but this was not prohibitory of the joy-tradition of the day. In the priestly days that followed, the mischief crept in; the narrow insistence of a literal interpretation of the command; the worry as to what "thou shalt not work" involves, and the finical attempt to weight out the burden of the "thou shalt not," spoiled the spontaneity of the day's joy in the tax of the day's exaction.

Then Jesus came, and we know what he did. He was a "Sabbath breaker" in the eyes of the Jews. He was a heretic in this as in so many other things of Jewish orthodoxy. "Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," he

proclaimed. It is a day to do good things in; Jesus insisted on the "sane Sabbath."

The early disciples continued the "heresy" of Jesus. Their "Lord's day" was not the later Jewish Sabbath at all. Originally it had an entirely different significance, and that significance persisted through the Roman Catholic dominance; it was joy-day and worship-day combined. It was the Protestant Puritans who attempted to identify "Lord's day" with Jewish Sabbath, and provide not only for "Lord Day's worship," but for the Sabbath day's repression. The Puritan Sabbath has worked pretty well in some places but not so well in others. The whole tendency of things nowadays is to throw it vehemently overboard.

What shall we do about it, after our modern way of thinking? First, I think that we do well to go back to the original Jewish conception. Let's insist rigorously on the "health day" which the Sabbath was intended to be. The day of release from toil has stupendous value to all social and individual good health. Let's take mighy pains not to lose its great advantages. Under modern conditions some men must work on Sunday to keep the world going. We cannot help that. But all the more let us strive vigorously to keep the encroachment of toil on Sunday as small as possible. And because inevitably some men must work on Sunday, I believe it is a part of good church business to do something, all together, to help bring it about that those who work on Sunday may be secured their Sabbath of rest some other day in the week. I am inclined to think that all the ministers of all the churches working together toward this end might accomplish a more religious result even than by working together to shut up Sunday "show-places." The holiness of good health is as much the Lord's business today as it was in the days of the Mosaic legislation.

But in the name of social good health I insist that it would be a stupendous mistake to throw away the opportunity which this day affords of bringing to focus the attention and the interest of men in life's great idealisms—the things which Religion stands for. Because we are all of us animals struggling to be men; also souls of divinity struggling to be rid of an animal inheritance; urged inwardly by superb ideals, and all humanity concerned in its passion of ethical and spiritual progress. It is good sense to make a dominant factor in the "holy day of social good health" the gathering of men and women for the consecrating of their ideals, the worship of God; the quickening of the aspiration of essential immortality. It is stupidest of folly to throw this value of the Sabbath to the scrap-heap, both for society and for the individual. Every sane man ought to heed its significance in moral sanity; ought to "make his date with his ideal," each week, as rigorously as he "makes his date" with the morning breakfast. It counts in the thing that keeps him a man.

Personally, I believe that one such gathering for religion, if it is the right sort of a gathering, is adequate for one day. Reduplication does not multiply, but may weaken the effect. Ennoble that one service by magnifying its intensive quality—take pains that its religion be big enough to fit its roomy opportunity; there is not room in it for petty dogmatisms, for arid superstitutions, for pious self-seeking, for attempting "godliness" —some robust, eager, magnanimous spaciousness of optimistic zest of service, some sense of a godliness that is big as the soul's best dream of love and life—one such royal worship-service of living faith might make a whole weektime afterward richer in its inevitable overflow.

For the rest of the day—what? Individual taste and sense of fitness of things must decide that for each soul. But all gloom must be kept out; all wholesome joy let in. For myself, I believe that this "health day" is holier if much of it be spent in God's great out-of-doors, under the big sky and in the vision of spacious landscapes, and with the breath of the free air lavish in ones nostrils. For a good many busy men a game of golf on Sunday is as innocent and more wholesome than sitting indoors, reading the Sunday newspaper, or gossiping with a neighbor. I would rather have some boys go to a lusty baseball game on Sunday than sit about some other boys' doorstep swapping unclean stories. A bad play at the theatre on Sunday evening is a pitiable profanation of a holy day; I can imagine some good plays

that might really bring into the day an exalting consecration. But these are matters of private conscience and taste. It is well to beware of the temptation to try to make one's own conscience play despot over the consciences of those who have other ideals.

There is something that I believe the churches might do to improve the range of possibility for sane Sunday observance for many people. As things are now, each church has its own particular Sunday evening service, and when the average minister is honest he will admit that his Sunday evening service is his most discouraging function. Suppose all the churches should merge their Sunday evening into one big enterprise, and make that enterprise one not just for church people; but for all sorts and conditions of people—not even religious, in the narrower sense of the word; but inspiring, exalting, joy-bearing, rest-winning in some large sense of the word; with a program of rich music; inspiring readings from masters, of talks by interesting speakers about things that people like to hear about, in nature, literature, art, history, and the like; with a divine common sense in the making of progress, and a vital sense that there is a multitude of men and women whom the churches do not touch now, but might reach thus with wholesome influence! Why would it not pay the churches to hire the biggest theatre in the city every Sunday night, *and pay the price* and compete with the poorer things which the "movies" give, with something popular, but to their own ideal? Perhaps it would do the churches good to become "secular" on Sunday evenings—to the glory of God!

Our Readers' Exchange

EDITOR OF THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE:

In his notice of the New Hymn Book in the June number of The Advance, the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, referring to the inclusion in that book of Ebenezer Elliott's, "When Wilt Thou Save The People," says: "When a popular song of revolt, written by the Corn-Law Rhymer gets into a book published by American Unitarians at 25 Beacon St., Boston, something has come to pass in our day and generation."

Mr. Holmes is much belated in his information and rather unjust in his implication. In 1895, the A. U. A. published, "Hymns for Church and Home," edited by Mrs. Tileston, and in 1896 issued an abridgment of it, Elliott's hymn being included in both editions. These books have been used, and this hymn has been sung in Unitarian churches in and about Boston for many years. Indeed "it has come to pass" considerably before our day that hymns have been sung, prayers have been offered, and sermons have been spoken concerning social justice in these churches, and it is plain injustice to speak and write as if the fact were otherwise.

FREDERIC GILL.

Arlington, Mass.

EDITOR'S NOTE: We are glad to have Mr. Gill make this statement and are sure that our reviewer will readily accept the correction. Of course in essential substance it does not affect the point which Mr. Holmes wished to make; for Mrs. Tileston's book was not compiled either by The A. U. A., nor for the A. U. A. in its original form, but was simply taken over by the Association practically as Mrs. Tileston herself had revised it, without any detailed searching out of its contents. The abridgment of 1896 was also Mrs. Tileston's work. All that Mr. Holmes meant to say obviously was that in times past the A. U. A. has tended to be conservative in issues of Social Justice, but that more recently it has tended to more progressive positions, as this book would indicate. We do not enter into any argument as to this contention, which was only by the way in Mr. Holmes' very fair-minded review of the new hymn book; but does not Mr. Gill himself, in the closing sentence of his letter, unconsciously assume a tone of the same sort of injustice for which he seeks to censure our reviewer? Neither Mr. Holmes nor any one else, so far as we know, has ever contended

that "hymns have (not) been sung, prayers been offered, or sermons spoken concerning Social Justice" in Unitarian churches about Boston "for many years," and it is unjust to speak as though such statements have been made. That the modern distinction between "social service" and "social justice" has not always been held clear, and that the zest for the cause of social justice has not always or everywhere been as eager as might be desired, are facts that we all agree upon, though the degree of delinquency may seem greater to some of us than to others. The important thing is to recognize that times are changing, and that we are changing with the times, and that our superb responsibility in our progressive faith is that we resolutely help the times to change for the better, and not merely wait for "the times" to change us! We append a note from Mr. Holmes to whom we have submitted Mr. Gill's letter and our reply.

EDITOR OF THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE:

Thank you for letting me see Mr. Gill's letter, and your wholly satisfactory reply thereto. I do not care to enter into the controversy, except to put on record the fact which you could not in the nature of things know, that I was quite aware of the presence of Elliott's hymn in "Hymns for Church and Home." It never entered my head, however, to classify this book with the 1877 book and the new book reviewed by me, as an A. U. A. publication. I had always regarded Mrs. Tileston as responsible for this book, just as I admit thinking of myself as responsible for Collyer's "Clear Grit." That I used the phrase, "a book published by the A. U. A." without qualification, however is indubitable, and my critic is therefore entitled to all the exultation and joy that he can get out of this technicality. That a man of Brother Gill's intellectual eminence, ripe scholarship and hitherto comradely spirit should have seized with such savage glee upon this trivial detail of phrase, to the utter neglect, if not deceptive defiance, of the obvious purport of my review as a whole, furnishes an illuminating commentary on the Unitarian habit of mind toward present day sociological discussion.

J. H. H.

BROWNING AND A NOTED HYMN.

THE hymn which the band on the ill-fated Titanic is reported to have played as the great liner sank from sight, "Nearer My God to Thee," now has an added significance which will go down in history. It is something of a coincidence that the hymn should have been brought into renewed prominence at the time of the centenary of the men who inspired it, for Robert Browning was very intimately associated with its composition.

Robert Browning's connection with this hymn is not generally known, and the writer became acquainted with it quite by accident when she chanced upon an account of the centenary of South Place, Finsbury, which was bound with a miscellaneous collection of pamphlets in the library of the British museum. South Place Chapel is the church where Rev. George J. Fox, the friend of Browning, used to preach, and it was the place where the famous hymn was first sung, many years before it was published.

Mr. Fox was appointed guardian of Sarah and Elizabeth Flower, the two beautiful and talented daughters of his friend, Benjamin Flower, on the death of their father, and they became members of his household, which was located in the vicinity of the Browning home. The boy, Browning, was about twelve years old when his mother first became acquainted with the two young women, who were nine and seven years his senior. He had just composed his first verses, which he called "Incondita," and which were subsequently destroyed, but not before his fond mother had shown them to Miss Flower, and she had, secretly, shown them to her guardian. Mr. Fox immediately became interested in the promising lad and encouraged him in his poetic dreams.

The Flower sisters were very fond of Mrs. Browning's children, and they had many interests in common with the Browning family. They were very musical, as were the Brownings, and, consequently, they were frequent guests in the Browning home. The elder sister became the boy's ideal and, in his early teens, he wrote her boyish verse and letters, all of which he destroyed when

they fell into his hands in later years. It has been said repeatedly that she inspired his first ambitious poem, "Pauline."

But it was Sarah, the younger sister, whom he made his confidante. To her he confided his longings to go on the stage, and she laughingly told him that she, too, had once thought that she would like to be an actress. Then came deeper confidences, and the young woman found herself in the position of adviser to a boy who was passing through a period of atheistic doubt. For, about this time, he had become infatuated with Shelley's poetry and had also begun to read the philosophy of Voltaire. In trying to be of help to her young friend, Sarah Flower became involved in her own arguments, and thus she wrote of her perplexity to her guardian in a letter which was printed in the pamphlet mentioned above and is here quoted in part:

"My mind has been wandering a long time, and now seems to have lost sight of that only invulnerable hold against the assaults of this warring world—a firm belief in the genuineness of the Scriptures. . . . The cloud has come over me gradually, and I did not discover the darkness in which my soul was shrouded until, in seeking to give light to others, my own gloomy state became too settled to admit of doubt. It was in answering Robert Browning that my mind refused to bring forward argument, turned recreant, and sided with the enemy."

Later Miss Flower said that in seeking a way out of her "stony griefs" she wrote the hymn, "Nearer, My God, to Thee," which she and her sister first sang as a duet in the South Place Chapel, where they led the singing. Browning had already outgrown the period of atheism which had troubled his friend, but it is doubtful if the hymn which is so dearly loved by thousands would ever have been written if it had not been for his influence upon Miss Flower.—SARAH G. POMEROY in *"Zion's Herald."*

The Real Division In Christendom

BY REV. E. H. REEMAN,

Minister of The Church of Our Father, Lancaster, Pa.

ONE of the most striking facts that confronts the student of the Christian religion is the remarkable number of sectarian distinctions that divide the Christian world. On every hand one is met with a multiplicity of sectarian organizations, all claiming to represent some vital principle of the Christian religion, and all more or less rival each to the other. The confusion resulting from this multiplicity of factions must be more than a little bewildering to a plain man seeking to know the truth about Christianity.

I often wonder what must be the actual effect upon a native mind, trained in the spirit of some other religion, as it observes the rivalry existing between Christian sects upon the mission field; as it listens, now to a Catholic denunciation of Protestantism, and now to a Protestant exposure of Catholicism; as it is urged, now to trust its salvation to the authority of a church, and now to look to the blood of a crucified Christ as its only hope, and to spurn all priestly mediation between the soul and God. That something of the anomaly of the present situation is forcing itself upon the Christian mind is evidenced by many praiseworthy recent efforts in the direction of church unity. The more one studies the rivalries and divisions forced upon us by sectarianism the more patently foolish do these things appear in the great majority of cases.

When we come to consider them rationally and impartially, what do half our sectarian division really amount to? Nine times out of ten they apparently turn upon points that do not matter two straws anyway. Excepting the division that separates Protestant from Catholic —a division, let us frankly admit, that is based upon a profound difference in conception and spirit and in radically different fundamental principles of religious authority—what actually do the great majority of differences between the churches amount to? Probably the most fundamental are those that spring from

varying conceptions of church polity. Whether the foundation of church polity shall be based upon an Episcopacy, a Presbyterian or a Congregational order seems to be the only really valid thing that keeps apart many of the greatest religious organizations of the Christian world. But what does this really amount to when all is said and done? Is there any logical excuse in such a reason for the duplication in every city of the land of churches and religious organizations, the value, usefulness and efficiency of which from their own standpoint would be increased a hundredfold by united corporate action?

It must be obvious to any intelligent student that the day of sectarian denominationalism is done. The outside world, represented in the man in the street, whom it is the mission of the church to reach, touch and convert, is every day coming to care less and less about the rivalries of sectarianism and indeed to find in them only an excuse for indifference to the appeal of religion. Practical experience, moreover, is teaching the various denominations a valuable lesson that cannot be without effect in the direction of church unity. In great evangelistic campaigns churches of all denominations have found it not only advisable, but in the highest degree profitable to unite their efforts. In various social activities also it has been abundantly proved that the weight of the opinion which the churches can bring to bear upon any question is immensely increased when the opinion represents the collective voice of the churches speaking in unison and harmony. In the organization of two countries, that of the Federal Churches of Christ, in America, and that of the Evangelical Free Church Council, in Great Britain, practical experience has done much to dissolve the sectarian differences that until recently have arbitrarily divided Christian men and women. Throughout Christendom it is rapidly being evidenced that the old sectarian divisions are not only foolish and harmful, but positively without any really justifiable foundation. Gradually, it would appear, the way is being paved for a unity and co-ordination of church and religious activity that, if it will not immediately remove the old denominational distinctions, will at least render them meaningless and invalid.

Does there then remain any other divisive force that can justify separation? If so, what is it? I wish it to be understood that I am a profound believer in religious unity, and that upon a truly universal basis I am prepared to make such unity the end of all my personal effort. But the very nature of the only conceivable unity of a universal kind makes it imperative that we face one or two facts quite frankly. And the first and most important fact, the only one, indeed, I am concerned to touch upon at this time, is that there does exist in the Christian world a real division that has its roots in fundamental principles, which it is impossible to ignore. The division of which I speak is of a profoundly more important character than all the petty sectarian differences that today divide denominations; and is one which, if rightly understood, must separate not denomination from denomination, but certain men of all denominations, or at least of most, from certain other men of all or most denominations. It is a division that goes far deeper than the division between Catholic and Protestant, and it is sufficiently great, I believe, to unite Catholics and Protestants upon both sides of the golf which it marks.

The fundamental difference between Catholic and Protestant after all is far more a difference in regard to the seat of authority in religion than a difference as to the nature of authority. To all intents and purposes all the Evangelical sects are one in essential theological doctrine, while the differences that divide Catholic from Protestant, theologically speaking, are of comparatively small importance. It has always seemed to me that between Protestant orthodoxy and Catholic orthodoxy, so far as the fundamental conception of religion is concerned, there is very little to choose. And between the two I thing the Catholic brand would be quite as acceptable to me personally as the Protestant. No, the fundamental division in Christendom is not between Catholic and Protestant, and sooner or later, I believe, this will be plainly seen. The real division in Christendom is between what may be called religious orthodoxy and religious heterodoxy—the division between the religion of authority, in whatever ecclesiastical form it may clothe itself, and the religion of the spirit, wheresoever it may be found, whether in

the form of modernism in the Catholic Church or liberalism in the Protestant. The sectarian issues that are often flaunted do but serve to disguise the real line of demarcation in Christian thought. I have no quarrel with orthodox theology beyond the fact that it embodies a conception of religion against which every instinct of my being rebels and which my conscience compels me to challenge. As consistent advocates of a definite conception of religion I am prepared at all times to extend to the representatives of orthodox theology my sincere respect, though I must retain my right to declare that my own conception of religion is opposed to theirs. But I wish to do this without any trace of bitterness or superiority.

The fact to which it is high time the world awoke, and which it seems to me it is the duty of all honest men to make plain, is that there exists between the conception of religion upon which liberal Christianity is built up and the conception of religion which is the underlying basis of Evangelical theology a fundamental distinction. The standpoint of liberal Christian people, in whatsoever denominational or ecclesiastical communion they are found, is absolutely distinct from, and opposed to, the standpoint of conventional religious orthodoxy, and until this is recognized I do not see that any real adjustment is possible.

The present policy of all too many liberal preachers—a policy of expediency and compromise—cannot, it seems to me, result in anything but prejudice to the liberal cause and harm to the best orthodox interests. The dictates of simple honesty would seem to demand that the time has now come for liberal Christians to get together, and with all tolerance, but with absolute candor, say to their orthodox brethren: "Brethren, it is our duty to declare to you that the conception of religion we are concerned to defend and propagate is no longer that which is the underlying basis of Evangelical theology; for the honesty of your opinions, we respect you, while the honesty of our own demands that we shall not hide from you our differences. If you are right, we are wrong; but since conscience compels us to take this stand we are content to leave the final issue to the one God whom, though we differently conceive, we alike worship in sincerity and truth. If your tolerance is such that you are willing to allow us to work side by side with you in the same organization, boldly and fearlessly, but with due sympathy, making plain the points of our differences, we shall rejoice to maintain the associations of the past, confident that when our real attitude is understood it will be acceptable to all. But if this cannot be, then, with no feelings of bitterness, but with many of real regret, we part from you, content to leave in your hands the buildings and organizations which orthodox money has erected and to shape for our own work new forms and means."

What might not be the effect of such an action in this great continent of America if all the representatives of liberal Christianity, both laymen and ministers, could together take action in such a spirit and from such a motive as I have indicated? Do you mean to tell me that it would not mean new life for religion for all the ministers of this great continent to cease repeating creeds and formulas in which they no longer believe, save in senses so strained and subtle that they cannot for a moment be identified with a literal sense, and to find in the liberty of free expression a means to the articulation of those great ideals, enthusiasms and religious passions that are burning within their breasts, but that are today half smothered by an attempt at a conformity that is really a compromise? That such a course of action might mean, as it would, sacrifice for many a brave soul argues nothing against it, but rather in its behalf. Immediately the note of a grand new challenge would sound in the appeal of religion, both from the side of the old and from the side of the new, and the old, unreal distinctions would be swallowed up in a great co-ordinating movement that would declare the only real division that exists in Christendom. Of the real differences that lie back of this division I cannot speak more briefly and plainly than in the words in which a writer once defined the breach between the Catholic medieval and the Catholic modernist—a breach that is nowhere better illustrated than in the contrast between the spirit of the writings of Father George Tyrrell and that of the encyclical of Pope Pius X. against modernism.

"The one regards religion as a law external to man and imposed upon him; the other regards it as a life given to man and springing up within him; the one regards faith as the acceptance of a dogma, defined by authority, the other as a living experience—a vision of God and a fellowship with him; the one regards theology as essential to religion, if not identical with it, the other as an intellectual expression of religion always imperfect and always subject to change; the one regards the visible church as a divine organization out of which a truly religious life is well nigh impossible, the other as an outward, visible, imperfect expression of that fellowship which binds together all those who are actuated in their lives by a love for God and their fellowmen; the one combats error by ecclesiastical censure, reinforced when practicable by civic penalties, the other corrects errors solely by an appeal to the reason and the conscience."

One, in a word, is a religion of authority, a thing of creeds and dogmas and historical texts, the other is a free religion of the spirit—that spirit within man which ever reaches out towards the divine and is responsive most of all to the highest appeals that can be made to its own essential dignity and divinity.

THE GREATEST OF THESE.

By Rev. James G. Townsend.

I THINK I never read the melodious words of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, Paul's eulogium of charity (and I read them very often) without having a higher appreciation of their beauty or the suggestion of a new truth. May I present the suggestion that came to me, like a revelation, upon the latest reading?

Paul says that "charity" is greater than eloquence, than the tongue of angels; and though a man may have all knowledge, and a colossal "faith," that is, a mighty belief in a book, or in a person, or in a supposed truth, and have not "charity," he is nothing but "sounding brass."

And Paul even more audaciously goes on to say that a man may give all his money to feed the poor and his body to be burned, and if he have not "charity" he will not "profit" anyone. How true this is! For a man may do these great deeds in mere ostentation, and those for whom they are done may have taken away from them their self-respect and independence.

But what is this "charity" which is higher, more potent than the things which the world calls great—eloquence, benevolence, money, knowledge, martyrdom, saintship, or even success? "Charity" is simply kindness which expresses itself in sympathy, in friendliness, in pleasing, in those common gestures of good-ill—the touch of the hand, the word, the light of the face, the tear of compassion, the scattering here and there of little pearls of purity and tenderness. These are the things which, under the conditions I will indicate, make for human happiness and human progress, for order, manhood and beauty more than the great achievements which win the applause of the multitude. These common, homely, kindly, inconspicuous attitudes and acts are the tiny, innumerable threads which, in their sum, tie society together. Without them, the web, the embroidery of human brotherhood could never be woven.

We cannot tell how much we owe to those men and women of "charity," of high ideals, a noble conception and love of the beautiful who, without the genius of Shakespeare, Jane Austen or Victor Hugo, reveal the happiness which so many sad eyes fail to see, and find so many ways of making the meanest human life richer and more courageous.

Now, in the light of this truth, I have been hastening to say, that there is too much of giving, of sacrifice, of benevolence, of surrender of self, health, life and the opportunity of growth and personal development. There are too many Jane Austen's Fanny Prices in the world. Well, some will ask, would you increase the number of those of whom Mrs. Norris is a type? It must be confessed that Mrs. Norris was infinitely shy about letting anyone see the color of her money, but she was wonderfully free with her tongue, her advice. And if, unlike the prudent and indolent Mrs. Norris, there is a tutor who gives a real instruction, and to that instruction adds the element of sympathy, will not he, like a Christ, lighten the burden of the "laboring and heavy laden," and it may be with his tears of pity quench the fires

of pain, of anguish and of fear in many a human heart?

But we are too often in bondage to the tragic, the loud, the pretentious, the conspicious. I presume that Garrick was the greatest actor that ever appeared upon the stage. But his greatness was not shown in impassioned utterances. Fielding tells us of the impression made upon the old schoolmaster, who had never been to a play, when taken to hear Garrick in Hamlet. The pedantic schoolmaster thought the king was the best actor because he talked so loud, and he spoke contemptuously of Garrick as "the little fellow who was frightened at the ghost." And then he went on to say: "Why, in that scene between him and his mother, where you tell me he acted so fine, good Lord help me! Any man, that is, any good man, that has such a mother would have done exactly the same."

The conventional old teacher did not know he had paid the actor the highest compliment, and that in these simple, homely, tender touches, these petits soins, Garrick had shown his supreme genius.

No, it is not "the kings who speak so loud," that are great, martyrs, heroes, saints whose pale, seraphic faces are eloquent of an indefatigable devotion to some great cause, but the millions of men of purity, of manliness, of courage, of intelligence—men of "charity," of kindness who, in going about their work, by touch of hand, by a word, or a glance of the eye, throw a gleam of light into some dark and gloomy hearts, and scatter seeds of compassion which shall blossom into beauty in some of the waste places of human life.

A DREAM OF THE ALMIGHTY.

By Peter Rossegger, *in Chicago Herald.*

LAST night I had this dream: The Eternal sat upon the judgment seat and caused the great throng of humanity to pass before Him. The Judge said to Moses: "What didst thou give to thy people?"

"The law."

"What did they make of it?"

"Sin."

Then He asked Charlemagne:

"What didst thou give to thy people?"

"The altar."

"What did they make of it?"

"The stake."

Then He asked Napoleon Bonaparte:

"What didst thou give to thy people?"

"Glory."

"What did they make of it?"

"Shame."

So He asked many, and each one made complaint that his gift had been dishonored by his people.

At last the Eternal asked also His Only Begotten:

"My Beloved Son, what didst thou give to men?"

"Peace."

"What did they make of it?"

Christ answered not. With pierced hands He hid His face and wept.

COMMISSION ON THE NEW DENOMINATIONAL NAME.

In accordance with the instructions of the last annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association held in May, President Eliot has announced the appointment of the following commission of ten persons to report on the possibility and advisability of adopting a name more expressive of the actual purpose of our denomination than the name "Unitarian." This important commission will be composed of Charles W. Eliot of Cambridge, president of the General Conference; Augustus M. Lord of Providence, formerly president of the Ministers' Institute; William H. Carruth of Palo Alto, Cal., formerly president of the Missouri Valley Conference; Miss Emma C. Low of Brooklyn, formerly president of the Women's Alliance; William Kent, formerly of Chicago, now a member of Congress from California; Samuel M. Crothers of Cambridge, the mover of the resolution; Minot Simons of Cleveland, chairman of the Council of the General Conference; Marcus P. Knowlton of Springfield, formerly Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts; Sanford Bates, president of the Young People's Religious Union; and Lewis G. Wilson, secretary of the Association.

In announcing these appointments through the columns of the *Christian Register* of July 23rd, Dr. Eliot makes this statement: "Several gentlemen to whom I made application felt obliged to decline to serve.

"It will be at once perceived that this is a thoroughly representative commission. It represents all parts of the country, all types of mind in our body, our various official organizations, and the best character and wisdom of our communion. Some are veterans in the service of our cause, and others belong to the younger generations. While different points of view are represented, I have consciously and intentionally made this commission to consist chiefly of persons who have privately or publicly expressed their interest and sympathy in the proposal to discover "a name more

expressive of the actual purpose of our denomination than the name 'Unitarian.' I am not, indeed, acquainted with the predisposition of several of the members, knowing only that they will approach this subject with the desire to recommend whatever may appear to be just, expedient, and wise; but, so far as I am aware of the predilections of these ladies and gentlemen, I believe that most of them are in sympathy with the ideas expressed by the secretary of the Association in his Annual Report. I have adopted this course because it is well known that I have some decided opinions of my own about this proposal, and that, while my mind is open to any judicious suggestion or recommendation, I cannot now be counted among those who see any adequate reason for troubling ourselves with such a discussion. Let the proper time be taken to prevent further disorder and depreciation of property. Such joint action the United States, in accordance with its time-honored policy, is not willing to encourage. In Santo Domingo the United States has been administering the national finances and paying the foreign creditors since 1906, and the present disorders have reduced the revenues to the vanishing point."

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS.

The secretary, Rev. Ernest C. Smith, has been at the headquarters during July and August, save for a week's visit to the Lithia Springs Chautauqua and an occasional day at home. There has been an unusual number of visitors at the headquarters this summer, largely ministers passing through Chicago and men desiring to enter our ministerial fellowship. The correspondence has concerned itself mainly with the programs of the state conference and the arrangements for the hearing of candidates in the fall.

The Iowa State Conference will be held jointly with the Universalists at Cedar Rapids October 6-9. The Illinois Conference will be held at Alton, October 15-17; Michigan at Ann Arbor, October 19-20. It is not yet quite certain whether the Wisconsin Conference will hold a session this year or not. If one is held it will come between the Iowa and Illinois meetings. The programs will appear in our October issue.

"The churches of the district have been closed, save in the college towns. At Urbana, Madison and Ann Arbor services were held during the month of July with a very satisfactory attendance of students from the summer schools.

On July 1st, Rev. J. W. Cooper resigned his pastorate at Davenport to enter business and to become a candidate for congress on the progressive ticket. Rev. John H. Wilson of Wilton, N. H., is to become the associate of Rev. George A. Thayer of Cincinnati at the renewal of worship in September. It is the hope to enlarge the activities of the church by this accession and not simply to supplement the ordinary pulpit work. Three representatives of the Sunday school attended the institute at Meadville in early July and report an inspiring series of discussions. The Dayton church reports that Dr. Marshall is much improved, that he is rapidly regaining his health and strength and expects to be in fine condition for taking up his work in the fall. The church building is nearing completion much more rapidly than had been expected. The exterior is nearly complete, and the interior work is under way. It is hoped that the building will be ready for occupancy October 15th, with a dedication about Thanksgiving time. The building is admirably located, very attractive in appearance and our work at this point in the next year should develop rapidly. The women of the alliance have raised about $1300 for the furnishings of the building. The church at Youngstown has extended a unanimous call to Rev. F. M. Bennett, field agent of the Middle States Conference, which Mr. Bennett has accepted. He will begin his work at Youngstown September 1st. The congregation is heartily united in its choice of Mr. Bennett and enthusiastic over the outlook which is open by his acceptance of their call.

The Lithia Springs Chautauqua was held July 17-27. Naturally those who aided this movement when it was under the guidance and direction of Rev. Jasper L. Douthit will be interested to know that the old spirit seems to animate the new management. The class work was well kept up this year, covering bible study, kindergarten, chorus classes, nature study and physical culture, children's song, story and game hour and the regular round table work. Mr. Smith, the secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, preached on Sunday, July 19th and conducted a nature study class. For the first time in many years the receipts and expenditures roughly balanced. The management is now quite hopeful of maintaining the regular sessions upon a paying basis.

THE MEADVILLE INSTITUTE.

The session of 1914 was a record one in Meadville institute work. To begin with, the attendance, at least sixty in all, was the largest in the six years in which the institute has been held. Nearly every one of this number was doing actual work in Sunday schools, either as teacher or superintendent. Fifteen of the members were from the German Protestant churches in Pittsburgh, Columbus, and Cincinnati. Dr. Thayer's church for the first time sent teachers from their school, three young women who have gone back full of enthusiasm over the Meadville opportunity and carrying well-considered plans for the work of the coming year. Similar reports come from other churches in the district. The members came from Buffalo (3), Cincinnati (3 from First Church, 8 from St. John's German Church), Cleveland (5), Columbus (Independent German, 5), Dayton (3), Erie (5), Pittsburgh (First Church, 8, German Church, 2), Meadville (4 paid scholarships, several in regular attendance at one or more lectures) and Washington, D. C., one. Twenty-eight of these came on scholarships provided by the church, Sunday school, alliance or individuals, which shows how great an interest the churches in this locality are taking in the training of their Sunday school teachers.

The earnest and eager spirit of the students

was marked. Four lectures were given daily, and on five of the ten days a fifth session, either conference or bible reading, was added. Practically all of the students were at every session; while at evening lectures and some morning ones, there was a good attendance from the residents of Meadville. The presence of several M. T. S. students and graduates, and two of the ministers of our churches, added much to the interest.

The courses, five in number, were given without a single variation from the program printed two months earlier. Prof. Clayton R. Bowen gave an admirable series on "The New Testament and Our Religious Life." The three members of the faculty of Religious Education of the American Unitarian Association were all present and lecturing. Dr. Starbuck's course on "The Psychological Basis of Religious Teaching," was rich in wisdom, stimulating and suggestive. The practical work of the teacher was treated by Rev. Florence Buck in a helpful course on Methods of Teaching, illustrated by lessons from the Beacon Series. Dean Lawrence gave illuminating bible readings, and conducted conferences on different phases of Sunday school work, both of which were so much appreciated that extra sessions of each were requested. He gave the opening lecture, and the sermon on Sunday morning. Even the Sunday was made to count toward teacher training, as large numbers of institute members attended the session of the Sunday school, where the older section was taught by Dr. Starbuck, the younger by Miss Buck.

An unusual feature of this year's session, and one much appreciated, was the course on "Religious Education in the Church School," by Rev. Wm. H. Boocock, of Buffalo. He is director of religious education in the First Presbyterian Church there, and has a highly organized and efficient school. His word was filled with the wisdom which comes from thorough knowledge, practical experience, and a consecrated spirit. An evening lecture by Prof. Greve on "The Modern Religious Spirit in Germany," was greatly enjoyed.

Yet it was not all work at Meadville! Those who could give trained attention to the lectures brought the same eager spirit to the recreation hours. Quoits (a favorite amusement in the early morning hours), tennis, golf, bowling, basket ball, dancing and excursions, were all popular; while the closing entertainment by the students showed the range of their abilities and furnished rollicking fun. The minister and people of Meadville church gave the institute a cordial welcome, furnishing a picnic supper, and social hour during the first week. It was easy and natural to turn from these pleasures to the quiet periods of devotion, morning chapel and the never-to-be-forgotten good night service under the stars.

A member of the faculty and a student were rejoicing together over the success of the institute. "We will have a bigger and a better one next year," said the first. "It may be bigger," the student replied, "it could not be better." That is a much appreciated tribute. Yet, with the added insight and knowledge which a year can bring, Meadville Institute of 1915 can be better, and it will be.

THE NEW ENGLAND FELLOWSHIP COMMITTEE.

Rev. Francis Treadway Clayton of the Presbyterian ministry, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted July 9, 1914. Committee—Louis C. Cornish, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

Rev. Daniel Moses Welch of the Harvard Divinity School, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted July 9, 1914. Committee—Louis C. Cornish, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

Rev. Edward Perry Daniels, of the Meadville Theological School, having satisfied the Committee on Fellowship of the New England States, is hereby commended to our ministers and churches. Certificate granted July 31, 1914. Committee—Louis C. Cornish, Julian C. Jaynes, Robert F. Leavens.

THE MINISTERS' INSTITUTE.

The Ministers' Institute is planning to hold its next session at Newport, R. I. It has been found necessary to change the date of meeting from that advertised in Anniversary Week to September 21-24, a week earlier. The headquarters will be the New Cliffs Hotel, about ten minutes' walk from the railroad station. Rooms, including board, may be obtained (two in each room) for $2.50 a day for each person (with bath $3.00). Arrangements have also been made for entertaining a few of the ministers in private houses or otherwise, without expense to them. Ministers wishing to avail themselves of this arrangement are urged to write at once to Rev. William S. Jones, 29 Kay Street, Newport, R. I., and those wishing rooms at the hotel are requested to write as early as possible to Mr. J. V. Jordan, New Cliffs Hotel, Newport, R. I. All meetings will be held in Channing Memorial Church, or the parish house belonging to it, not far from the hotel. An excellent program has been prepared and will be sent at once to all the ministers. You cannot afford to miss this meeting of the institute. Let every minister come and bring his wife with him.

PRELIMINARY PROGRAMME OF THE MINISTERS' INSTITUTE, NEWPORT, SEPTEMBER 21-24, 1914.

Monday September 21: 8:00 p. m.—Opening address by President Southworth, followed by an address by Professor Nathaniel Schmidt of Cornell University on "Religion and Literature."

Tuesday, September 22: 9:00 a. m.—Devotional Service conducted by Rev. Sydney B. Snow of Boston. 9:30—"The Relation of Modern Physical Speculations to Religion." Rev. Joel H. Metcalf of Winchester, Mass. 10:15 a. m.—"The Theory of Religious Knowledge." Prof. Francis A. Christie, D. D.,

of Meadville. 11:00—Recess. 11:15—Address by Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt. Subject to be announced. 2:30 p. m.—A Religion for Today I. Its Ethics: Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer. II. Its Theology: Rev. Sidney S. Robins of Kingston, Mass. III. Its Worship: Rev. Frederick L. Hosmer, D. D. 4:15—Cliff Walk. 8:00—Address By Prof. Kirsopp Lake, D. D. of Harvard University. Subject to be announced. 9:30—Reception to the Ministers by the people of Channing Memorial Church.

Wednesday, September 23: 9:00 a. m.—Devotional Service conducted by Rev. John H. Lathrop of Brooklyn, N. Y. 9:30 a. m.—"The Strength and Weakness of our Theological Schools." Prof. Henry W. Foote and Rev. S. M. Crothers, D. D. 11:00—Recess. 11:15—"Immortality." Rev. Howard N. Brown, D. D. 12:00 m.—Address by Dr. Felix Adler. (expected) Subject to be announced. 2:30 p. m.—Church Efficiency. "The Place of the Church in the Community." Rev. John H. Applebee of Syracuse, N. Y. "Organization of the Congregation." Mr. W. H. Sayward of Boston. "Church Publicity," Rev. Edgar S. Wiers of Montclair, N. J. 4:15—Automobile Ride. 8:00—Address by Prof. W. W. Fenn, D. D. Subject to be announced.

Thursday, September 24: 9:00 a. m.—Devotional Service conducted by Rev. Lyman V. Rutledge of Bil'erica, Mass. 9:30—"The Lloyd George Policy in England." Rev. Edmund H. Reeman of Lancaster, Penn., and Rev. C. A. Wing of Concord, N. H. 10:45—"Political liberalism in England and America." Rev. Geo. Croswell, Cressey, Ph., D. D. 11:30—Adjournment.

The Meeting.

The excellence of the programme, the reasonable rates of the New Cliffs Hotel, the attractions of Newport, and the opportunity of getting together for the deeper things ought to bring a large number of our ministers to this meeting. The Institute needs money for its expenses, and every minister is asked to join the Institute by sending his membership fee of one dollar to Rev. Frederic J. Gauld, Treasurer, Leominster, Mass. Please read this appeal which is enclosed with this programme.

The evening meetings will be held in the Channing Memorial Church, all others in the Parish House.

The price of rooms *with* board will be "Two persons in one room, with bath, $3.00 per day, each person; two persons in one room, without bath, $2.50 per day each person." Not all of the rooms have two beds and you are urged to apply early to Mr. Joseph V. Jordan, New Cliffs Hotel, Catherine Street, Newport, R. I. The hotel is about ten minutes' walk from the station and very near Channing Memorial Church.

Arrangements have also been made for entertaining a limited number of ministers in private houses, or otherwise, without expense to them. Ministers wishing to avail themselves of this arrangement are requested to write at once to Rev. William S. Jones, 29 Kay Street, Newport.

A list of helpful books, prepared by a special Committee, will be given to each person attending. Come and make this a great meeting.

REV. "BILLY" SUNDAY IN COLORADO SPRINGS.

By Thomas Salter Robjent.

Reverend W. A. Sunday has come and gone. His coming was widely heralded for weeks before his arrival; his name, autobiography and picture—in every attitude and contortion of body—filled many columns of the local press.

All the orthodox churches in the city, with the exception of the Episcopal, First Congregational, Universalist, Christian Science, Lutheran, Catholic and Unitarian, formed themselves into a great boosting, routing body for the coming revival.

Prayer meetings were held three times a week in every section of the city; ministers preached laudatory sermons; and a voluntary choir of over five hundred voices was put in rehearsal; a tabernacle seating eight thousand was erected upon one of the finest and most central locations in the city. Under this waving of the evangelistic banners, Mr. Sunday came for a five weeks' campaign.

For five weeks great crowds attended the services held twice a day, and three times on Sundays. The first week of the campaign was given up to—what might be called—figuring Mr. Sunday in the role of a vaudeville actor or acrobat. Religion was hardly mentioned in his addresses, and the general impression that he made, was that of a "jolly good fellow." From the second week to the close "Hell" was his one theme. Unbelievers, and especially Unitarians, were gloatingly sent to the pit. At times Mr. Sunday's attack seemed almost to border on incentive to violence; as when one night, he sprang to the top of his pulpit, waving his hands crying, "Away with this 'damnable doctrine,' away with it into Hell!" and the crowd applauded him to the echo.

Mr. Sunday's going was equally spectacular; thousands thronged the station frantically waving him farewell; many eagerly sought for souvenirs—one woman hysterically snatched a newspaper from a man's hand because Mr. Sunday had touched it.

When we come to results, they are difficult to estimate. Opinions are as wide apart as the poles, and the people of the city are practically divided into great warring camps. Thousands treasure the memory of the evangelist's visit as almost akin to the coming of a God; others frankly regard his visit as nothing less than a pestilence and assert that the city will not recover from the blow dealt at christian charity and tolerance, for many months to come. The message proclaimed belongs wholly to centuries past, and has not borne a single tinge of modern scientific philosophy; it has been couched in language so full of slang and vulgarity, that many people have regarded it as nothing less than an insult to the ordinary courtesies of speech. These vulgarities have been clearly assumed, for at several drawing room meetings, which Mr. Sunday addressed, he divested himself of vulgarity, and on one occasion took as his text, Edward Everett Hale's, "The Man without a Country," carefully forgetting to mention that he was a Unitarian.

The conversions reported are about 4000,

and of these some 1200 were reconsecrations, and included most of the ministers of the city; of the balance the vast majority were children and young people between the age of ten and fifteen. Very few cases of the conversion of notorious evil doers are reported, and it is a very open question, how much of material gain for the churches has been really won.

As to the effect of the revival upon our own faith, there is no difference in opinion, either inside or outside our borders. It has been an unmixed blessing. From the moment of the initial discussion in the local ministerial association in regard to the question of inviting Mr. Sunday to the city, I made up my mind definitely that, conservative as the community is, and bitter as the personal attack would inevitably be upon myself, the one and only step to take was a clear-cut protest, and a square defence of our faith. I withdrew from the ministerial association and published my letter of resignation, stating fairly my reason for so doing, based upon a record of the evangelist in other cities; his known vulgarities; the mercenary side of his campaign and his constant and violent attack upon the faith which I represent. From that position, I never moved an inch.

The large tabernacle was erected a few blocks from our church, and many a boast was made by those within the orthodox ranks, that our congregation would be depleted from the opening of the campaign. The first Sunday of the revival our church was well filled and continued in this state until the last two weeks, when we had to bring in chairs. Up to date, sixty-seven have joined our ranks, every one of mature age, representing nearly every orthodox community in town, as well as others, who were non-attendants at church services, but who have been drawn in from the desire to show their colors, and to stand for a religion, that means decency and tolerance, and above all things the "Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man."

One Sunday evening, the protesting citizens arranged for a mass meeting in the Princess Theater, when I lectured on "Why I Protest against Mr. Sunday's Theology." The theater was packed—there was a scene of great enthusiasm. There have been many requests that similar services should be held Sunday evenings next fall in the same theater, and I have promised to deliver a course of lectures on rational religion.

Our church has never witnessed such a revival of interest and enthusiasm as at this moment. All we have gained has been through the definiteness of the message with which we have met the evangelist's attack. Our services were well advertised through the press, although we could obtain no free space, while full reports of Mr. Sunday's sermons were published. Our literature was distributed throughout the city; and about six thousand tracks were placed in the homes, as well as sent through the mail to selected names.

Every community, has of course, its peculiar atmosphere, but the experience taught me, by this campaign, is that fearlessness is its own reward; and that if we expect our liberal faith to win triumphs, it will only be as we show to the world that we are not ashamed of our gospel, and are not afraid to fight for it when occasion requires.

This revivalist seems to find a large part of his success through terrorizing communities. During the five weeks of his campaign, business men of this city have told me in confidence, that they dare not even whisper a protest. We have had some splendid examples of heroism in this respect, but I do feel that the burden lies upon the ministers of our faith —who are expected to be leaders, and who at least, from a professional standpoint have nothing to fear from attacks upon their faith and character—to let their voices ring out clear and distinct, and without a quiver, for common fairness and justice, as well as, liberality in religion in the communities in which this man and others sweep over, with all the tyranny and intolerance of ages that are past.

NEW BOOKS.

WHAT MEN LIVE BY; by Richard C. Cabot, Assistant Professor of Medicine, Harvard University; Houghton Mifflin Co.; 336 pp.; $1.50, net.

This is a book of delightful encouragement. For one thing, it is a matter of specific encouragement to have such a volume come from the hands of such a man. Dr. Cabot is preëminently one of the leaders in the medical profession of this country. His mind is engaged in specialized fields of his own department, and he is a very busy man. These are days when the cause of specific religion does not expect much from busy laymen except genial good will and liberal financial support. But here is a serious contribution to the religious literature of the day, coming from a man identified with the most progressive developments of his own profession—charmingly written, and manifesting acquaintance with wide ranges of literature and art.

It is the writing of a religious liberal who is fundamentally religious. We do not know how largely Dr. Cabot is indebted to Eucken for conscious suggestion; he acknowledges more frankly his indebtedness to Royce; but his book surely illustrates how a religious idealism like that of Eucken's can bear practical fruit in the mind and conscience of a modern man of the world who is also a man of the modern church. The fact that the writing of such a book seems worth while to a man in Dr. Cabot's position is a genuine satisfaction to every worker in the liberal religious cause.

Dr. Cabot divides his book into four parts, the four great interests "by which men live"—Work, Play, Love and Worship. We confess that we like the treatment of the first section best, so wholesome and sane, so illuminating and encouraging, along lines where the average man of today needs the steadying touch of enlightened common sense. But the discussion of play is also original, rational and enlightening. There were possibilities of peril surely in the section on Love. These are days when the problems of sex and marriage are unwholesomely accentuated in many places, while yet a certain recoil from modern extremes leads timid minds to a conservatism as unwholesomely reactionary. Dr. Cabot's point

of view is preëminently rational and sane, and he can speak with the voice of authority on many of the psychological aspects of these problems. Of worship he writes with a refined and tender tone of mysticism, an honestly modern mysticism, stripped of all merely conventional dogmatisms, but genuine and vital. Perhaps the values of this unique volume may well be summed up in these passages from its closing chapter:

"To live is to talk with the world. Work, Play, Love and Worship are four good ways of keeping up the conversation. . . . Each of the four languages in which we may talk with our neighbor, the world, falls on deaf ears and fails of response unless it is spoken with creativeness, with symbolism and with loyalty to a central motive. Work falls flat, play and art become sterile, love and worship become conventional, unless there is originality, personal creation in each. I must do my job in my own way, find an individual outlet in the symbols of art or game, and an individual answer in love and prayer if I am to feel at home in the world."

Clear Grit; a collection of Lectures, Addresses and Poems; by Robert Collyer; edited by John Haynes Holmes; American Unitarian Association; 328 pp.; $1.50, net.

Fortunate are those who had the privilege of hearing "Clear Grit," or "Robert Burns," or "Westminster Abbey," as they fell from the lips of Robert Collyer himself; so large a part of the charm of his lectures lay in the living personality of him who spoke; the quaint music of his Yorkshire accent; the splendid geniality of his benign countenance and towering form; the eloquence of his pauses and his smile, not less than of his spoken words. Yet to read these lectures and addresses anew is to realize in a fresh way how much of the charm inhered after all in the beautiful English diction, the striking originality of thought and vivid humanness of sympathy make the printed page adequate to preserve the essential substance of their power of life.

Of course the older generation of "lyceum lecturers," to which Dr. Collyer belonged, has forever passed. They do those things rather differently in modern "Chautauqua courses," and the like. But these chapters, which so well illustrate the elder style, present too most interestingly the personal range of interest and study which made the "Blacksmith preacher" fit to become a serious critic and interpreter of some of the best minds of his day. "The Human George Washington," and "The Human Heart of Luther," by their very titles tell us what manner of interpreter Robert Collyer was, and his lectures on Channing, Martineau and Robert Burns, on Charles Lamb and Hawthorne, and, with a difference, on Thoreau, are so much the more valuable because they are the adequate comprehension of essential values in preëminently great minds by a mind whose own training was homely, humble and restricted, yet richly endowed and trained after all to compass adequately the studies which he undertook.

The volume is well opened by a characteristic and most charming introduction by Mr. Holmes, the editor, and a small collection of Dr. Collyer's poems gives added value to the volume.

Religion As a Personal Experience; by William Milton Brundage; American Unitarian Association; 96 pp.

We are glad to have this book written by a Unitarian minister. Very much of our denominational writing goes to the lucid presentation of our intellectual positions—our philosophies and theologies. This is a book of the inner experience, persuasive for religious feeling as preëminent over "right thinking" or even "correct conduct," in their more austerely ethical and intellectual aspects. Dr. Brundage writes of Personal Religion, Need of Religion, The Consecration, The Service That Follows, The Assurance of Faith, The Transfiguration of Life, Worshiping and Working Together. His style is simple and luminous—sometimes even glowing; and always thoughtful and interesting. While not addressed specifically to young people, we can think of no better service that this book could render than to become a part of the preparation for confirmation or fellowship in church-membership among the young people growing up in our churches. We need more of this sort of thing in our fellowship, beyond all doubt. The sense of the vividly personal aspect of our liberal faith, the realization of religion not as a body of convictions but as an experience of personal life, the warmth and the glow and the ultimate peace of reality which essential religion actually is, are too often lost sight of among our people in the stress of the maintenance of our faith against other faiths. Dr. Brundage's little book is a wholesome manifestation of another spirit amongst us.

Little Lost Sister; by Virginia Brooks; Gazolles and Rickson; Chicago.

Alas, that it is necessary to have such books written! Miss Brooks writes with serious and noble purpose, and her writing is chaste and pure in tone. The story is of course artificial, and partly defeats its own purpose by too mechanical melodrama. It is not the work of a finished artist in modern fiction. Yet it is not lacking in a certain humaneness of charm and power, and all too real are the essential situations and problems with which it has to deal. The white slave traffic is no myth, and the social evil with which it is involved is the most insidious and corrupting evil with which modern society has to cope. Miss Brooks' way is one way, and the dramatization of her novel is doubtless intended to extend the range of its moral potency not a little. Personally, we do not go to the theatre or read novels to be ethically aroused or to "have our eyes opened," but some eyes can be opened in this way, perhaps, and Miss Brooks' writing is for the most part wholesome and restrained, if not quite of the highest literary art.

Self Training for Motherhood; by Sophia Lovejoy; American Unitarian Association; 182 pp.; $1.00 net.

This is a good book, and we are glad that our association has published it. The "voca-

tion of motherhood" is the noblest that human experience has attained to, perhaps, when its real nobility is honestly realized, and this book will help toward such realization. It deals with its problems frankly but with wholesome restraints. It is not a book of fads but of well winnowed common-sense. The titles of some of its chapters tell its essential story: The Vocation of Motherhood; The Art of Self-Criticism; The Training of the Body; The Training of the Senses; the Training of the Mind; Morals, Manners; The Financial Basis, The Study of the Child; The Discipline of the Child; The Mind of the Child; The Soul of the Child.

THE CULTURE OF ANCIENT ISRAEL; by Carl H. Cornill; Open Court Publishing Co.; Cloth, $1.50.

In "The Culture of Ancient Israel" we apparently have a collection of the contributions to periodical literature by Prof. Carl H. Cornill. In the first two, "The Rise of the People of Israel," and "Moses," Professor Cornill continues his work of popularizing the results of Old Testament criticism. The positions he sets forth are not extreme and the temper is irenic and apologetic. The other essays, "The Education of Children in Ancient Israel," "Music in the Old Testament" and "The Psalms in Universal Literature," one assumes to be by-products of the professor's regular work. Two of these essays are translated by our own Professor W. H. Carruth.

THE HISTORICAL CHRIST; by Dr. F. C. Conybeare, M. A. F. B. A.; Open Court Publishing Co.; Cloth, $1.50.

In "The Historic Christ" Dr. F. C. Conybeare gives us an investigation of the views of J. M. Robertson, Dr. A. Drews and Prof. W. B. Smith. In his early volumes "Myth, Magic and Morals," and "A History of New Testament Criticism," Dr. Conybeare has been a thoroughgoing opponent of traditional views and an eager defender of the free use in regard to the origins of Christianity of the same method of historical research which we apply to other ancient literatures and institutions. In this book he holds that the method of the writers he examined is quite as absurd and impossible as the method of traditionalism; that these writers are quite untrue to the standards of historical research, giving undue weight to superficial word resemblances, admitting or rejecting evidence on purely subjective grounds and jumping to quite unwarranted conclusions from the premises they lay down, that in their anxiety to uphold an extreme view they peril even that part of their case which is good. There is some repetition and an evident intent to picture his opponents as "light weights." This mars the effect of the book, but the judicious reader will not be troubled by this defect, since the scholarship is keen and the arguments weighty. It seems to really fulfill the aim it sets before itself—"to provide a middle way between traditionalism on the one hand and absurdity on the other." Certainly those who are reading the books of Messrs. Robertson, Drews and Smith will do well to also read this book of Dr. Conybeare.

The Unitarian Church at Los Angeles, Cal., has published a series of sermon lectures by its pastor, Rev. E. Stanton Hodgin, entitled "The Faith of the Reformers." The particular reformers considered are Wyclif, Savonarola, Francis David, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Ulrich Zwingli, Ignatius Loyola, John Milton, Oliver Cromwell and William Penn. A hasty reading convinces us that the church has done well to publish these addresses. There is no claim to completeness, but in each case a desire to find the faith or impelling power in the life of each leader considered. Just enough of the historical setting is given for an understanding of the person and his work. While definitely historical lectures, each one is also a sermon; for the high visions and lofty principles made clear by the treatment of each reformer are applied to our own time and its problems. The ten addresses are bound in heavy paper and can be supplied in lots of 100 for $10.00, single copies costing 25 cents.

THE REVIEWS.

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL for July contains: Creeds, Heresy Hunting and Secession in German Protestantism Today, by A. D. McLaren; Post-Modernism, by Rev. J. M. Thompson; Criminal Clerks, by Archibald Weir; "Sacraments and Unity," by Canon Adderley; Institutionalism and Mysticism, by the Very Rev. W. R. Inge; Mysticism and Logic, by Hon. Bertrand Russell; The Higher Anthropology, by Frances Howe Johnson; The Hereafter in the Bible and in Modern Thought; The Significance of Death, by Cassius J. Keyser.

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW for July contains: The Lord's Prayer, by Ernst von Dobschütz; Marriage and Social Control, by Anna Garlin Spencer; Bahaism—a Study of a Contemporary Movement, by Albert R. Vail; The Jesuits as Portrayed by Non-Catholic Historians, by William Walker Rockwell; Contemporary Philosophies of Religion, by Ralph Barton Perry; The Churches of France and their Separation from the State, by Albert Léo.

YALE REVIEW for July contains among other things: Literary Criticism in American Periodicals, by Bliss Perry; Latin America and the Monroe Doctrine, by Hiram Brigham; A. Pilgrim in Concord, by Henry A. Beers; New Opportunities in the Pacific, by Lincoln Hutchinson; High Prices and High Living, by Frederick S. Dickson; Liberty, Medieval and Modern, by A. F. Pollard; The Recovery of Lost Green Literature, by H. de Forest Smith.

Some characteristic titles of articles in the July-September number of THE UNPOPULAR REVIEW are: Unsocial Investments; A Stubborn Relic of Feudalism; The Way to Flatland; The Disfranchisement of Property; Minor Uses of the Middling Rich; Lecturing at Chautauqua; Academic Leadership; and The Muses on the Hearth.

Advertising Rates

List prices per month: special discounts for longer contracts.

1 Page	$10.00
Half Page	6.00
Quarter Page	4.00

Copy for advertisements must be furnished by the 20th of each month.

HUTCHINGS ORGANS

Hutchings organs are considered by expert judges to be the finest now made. They contain more valuable improvements than all others.

Write for list of instruments built and other information.

HUTCHINGS ORGAN CO.

18 TREMONT ST., BOSTON—156 5th Ave., New York

Pacific Unitarian School

for the Ministry.

BERKELEY, CAL. **Founded 1904**

Aims at thorough and scientific scholarship; emphasizes the application of religious ideals to municipal and social as well as individual life; gives complete preparation for the modern ministry and social service. It works in co-operation with the University of California and other Divinity Schools and affords an unusually wide choice of courses. Open to both sexes.

The year begins August 19, 1913. Write for the Register and complete information to the President.

EARL MORSE WILBUR, D. D.,
Pacific Unitarian School, Berkeley, California.

The Meadville Theological School

(Established 1844)

MEADVILLE, PA.

Trains men and women for a liberal and progressive ministry.

For catalogue address the president,

F. C. SOUTHWORTH

Mr. Pulsford's Sermons

RECENT ISSUES ARE

"God and the Soul"
"Tides of the Spirit"
"Myself and I"
"The Foundation of Faith"
"Nirvana"

Copies (5¢ each) may be had by mail from Unitarian Headquarters, 105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Point Breeze Inn and Bungalows

Located on an island off the coast. The woods, fields, and rocky shores, the pure sea air scented with the odor of evergreen trees, make an attractive place. Quiet and homelike. Accommodates sixty. Booklet. Address, J. H. Ambrose, Medomak, Maine.

Western Unitarian Headquarters

The Western Unitarian Conference maintains offices at 105 South Dearborn St., Chicago, which are open daily from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. (Saturdays 9 a. m. to 3 p. m.). All publications of the American Unitarian Association, including those of the Religious Education Department, and of Unity Publishing Committee, as well as all denominational periodicals are kept on sale and for distribution.

Secretary, REV. ERNEST C. SMITH

Headquarters Clerk, MISS LINA SCHEIBLE

Things Commonly Believed Amongst Unitarians Today

WE DECLARE our fellowship to be conditioned on no doctrinal tests and welcome all who wish to join us to help establish truth and righteousness and love in the world:

We believe that to love the Good and live the Good is the supreme thing in religion:

We hold reason and conscience to be final authorities in matters of religious belief:

We honor the Bible and all inspiring scripture, old or new:

We revere Jesus and all holy souls that have taught men truth and righteousness and love, as prophets of religion:

We believe in the growing nobility of man:

We trust the unfolding Universe as beautiful, beneficent, unchanging Order; to know this order is truth; to obey it is right and liberty and stronger life:

We believe that good and evil inevitably carry their own recompense, no good thing being failure, and no evil thing success; that heaven and hell are states of being; that no evil can befall the good man in either life or death; that all things work together for the victory of good:

We believe that we ought to join hands and work to make the good things better and the worst good, counting nothing good for self that is not good for all:

We believe that this self-forgetting, loyal life awakes in man the sense of union, here and now, with things eternal—the sense of deathlessness; and this sense is to us an earnest of the life to come:

We worship One in-All,—that Life whence suns and stars derive their orbits and the soul of man its Ought,—that Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, giving us power to become the sons of God,—that Love with whom our souls commune. This One we name—the Eternal God, our Father.